

EXHIBIT 8

Page 1

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
MDL NO. 16-2738 (MAS) (RLS)

IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON
4 TALCUM POWDER PRODUCTS
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES
5 AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION

	Page 2	Page 4
1 APP E A R A N C E S:		
2		
3 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF:		
4 (Via videoconference)		
ASHCRAFT & GERE L, LLP		
5 BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQ., and		
BY: PATRICK K. LYONS, ESQ.		
6 4900 Seminary Road, Suite 650		
Alexandria, Virginia 22311		
7 (844) 680-0339		
mparfitt@ashcraftlaw.com		
8 plyons@ashcraftlaw.com		
9 - and -		
10 (Via videoconference)		
LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY, P.A.		
11 BY: CHRISTOPHER V. TISI, ESQ.		
316 South Baylen Street		
12 Pensacola, Florida 32502		
(850) 435-7000		
13 ctisi@levinlaw.com		
14 - and -		
15 (Via videoconference)		
GOLOMB LEGAL		
16 BY: RICHARD GOLOMB, ESQ.		
1835 Market Street, Suite 2900		
17 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103		
(215) 278-4449		
18 rgolomb@golomblegal.com		
19		
20 ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEFENDANT:		
21 (Via videoconference)		
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP		
22 BY: JESSICA DAVIDSON, ESQ., and		
BY: NOAH EPSTEIN, ESQ.		
23 One Manhattan West		
New York, New York 10001		
24 (212) 735-3000		
jessica.davidson@skadden.com		
25 noah.epstein@skadden.com		
	Page 3	Page 5
1 I N D E X		
2		
3 EXAMINATION Page No.		
4 JACK SIEMIATYCKI, MSC, Ph.D.		
5 BY MS. DAVIDSON 10		
6 BY MS. PARFITT 208		
7 BY MS. DAVIDSON 227		
8 BY MS. PARFITT 241		
9		
10		
11 E X H I B I T S		
12		
13 Exhibit Description Page No.		
14 Defendant's Article entitled, 70		
Exhibit D1 "Association Between		
15 the Frequent Use of		
Perineal Talcum Powder		
16 Products and Ovarian		
Cancer: A Systematic		
17 Review and		
Meta-analysis," by		
18 Sean A.		
Woolen, MD, MSc,		
19 et al.		
20 Defendant's Declaration of 82		
Exhibit D2 Interest for IARC/WHO		
21 Experts		
22 Defendant's Letter from Jack 85		
Exhibit D3 Siemiatycki to IARC re		
23 Talc/Acrylonitrile		
Monograph 136		
24		
25		
1 I N D E X (Continued)		
2		
3 E X H I B I T S (Continued)		
4 Exhibit		
Name Description Page No.		
5 Defendant's Paper entitled, 91		
6 Exhibit D4 "Occupational		
environment and		
7 ovarian cancer risk,"		
by Lisa Leung, et al.		
8		
Defendant's Paper entitled, 95		
9 Exhibit D5 "Genital powder use		
and risk of epithelial		
10 ovarian cancer in the		
Ovarian Cancer in		
11 Women of African		
Ancestry Consortium,"		
12 by Colette P.		
Davis, et al.		
13		
Defendant's Second Amended Expert 106		
14 Exhibit D6 Report of Jack		
Siemiatycki, MSc, PhD		
15		
Defendant's Paper entitled, 108		
16 Exhibit D7 "Effects of risk		
factors for ovarian		
17 cancer in women with		
and without		
18 endometriosis," by		
Minh Tung		
19 Phung, MPH, PhD,		
et al.		
20		
Defendant's Paper entitled, 123		
21 Exhibit D8 "Douching, Talc Use,		
and Risk for Ovarian		
22 Cancer and Conditions		
Related to Genital		
23 Tract Inflammation,"		
by Iwona M.		
24 Gabriel, et al.		
25		
1 I N D E X (Continued)		
2		
3 E X H I B I T S (Continued)		
4 Exhibit		
Name Description Page No.		
5 Defendant's Paper entitled, "A 128		
6 Exhibit D9 critical review of		
talc and ovarian		
7 cancer," by Julie		
Goodman, et al.		
8		
Defendant's Paper entitled, "Talc 142		
9 Exhibit D10 powder and ovarian		
cancer: What is the		
10 evidence?" By John P.		
Micha, et al.		
11		
Defendant's Paper entitled, 162		
12 Exhibit D11 "Douching and Genital		
Talc Use: Patterns of		
13 Use and Reliability of		
Self-reported		
14 Exposure," by Katie M.		
O'Brien, et al.		
15		
Defendant's Paper entitled, "Use 168		
16 Exhibit D12 of personal care		
product mixtures and		
17 incident		
hormone-sensitive		
18 cancers in the Sister		
Study: A U.S.-wide		
19 prospective cohort,"		
by Che-Jung		
20 Chang, et al.		
21 Defendant's Supplemental Table S4 173		
Exhibit D13		
22		
23		
24		
25		

2 (Pages 2 - 5)

Golkow Technologies,

A Veritext Division

877-370-3377

www.veritext.com

	Page 6	Page 8
1 I N D E X (Continued)		1 MS. PARFITT: Most people don't
2 E X H I B I T S (Continued)		2 want to see it. So there you go. Thank
3 Exhibit		3 you, Jessica.
4 Name Description Page No.		4 MS. DAVIDSON: So you all are in
5 Defendant's Paper entitled, 194		5 the same room in Canada?
6 Exhibit D14 "Association of Powder		6 MS. PARFITT: Yeah. We're all in a
7 Use in the Genital		7 conference room.
8 Area With Risk of		8 MS. DAVIDSON: In Canada?
9 Ovarian Cancer," by		9 MS. PARFITT: In Canada, yes.
10 Katie M.		10 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I'm just
11 O'Brien, PhD, et al.		11 getting my bearings.
12 Defendant's Paper entitled, 204		12 MS. PARFITT: No, no. And where
13 Exhibit D15 "Quantitative recall		13 are you?
14 bias analysis of the		14 You're on the west coast.
15 talc and ovarian		15 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm on the west
16 cancer association,"		16 coast, correct. That's why we're starting
17 by Julie E.		17 late.
18 Goodman, et al.		18 MS. PARFITT: Okay.
19 Plaintiff's Pre-Publication Notice 209		19 THE COURT REPORTER: Would you
20 Exhibit P1		20 raise your hand, Doctor.
21		21 THE WITNESS: (Complies with
22		22 request.)
23		23 J A C K S I E M I A T Y C K I, MSc, Ph.D.,
24		24 having first been duly sworn, was examined and
25		25 testified as follows:
	Page 7	Page 9
1 MS. PARFITT: Michelle Parfitt and		1 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
2 Chris Tisi are here on behalf of the		2 You may proceed.
3 plaintiff steering committee along with		3 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, with your
4 Patrick Lyons from my office.		4 permission -- Ms. Davidson, with your
5 Richard, would you like to		5 permission, we would just like to make a
6 introduce yourself.		6 correction to Dr. Siemiatycki's
7 MR. GOLOMB: Yes. Richard Golomb		7 November 15th, 2023, report.
8 for the state court plaintiffs.		8 It is page 40, Section 8.1.2
9 MS. DAVIDSON: Hi, Richard.		9 entitled, "Results of my meta-analyses on
10 Michelle and Chris and Patrick, are		10 Ever/Never exposed to talc powder for all
11 you all in the same room as		11 ovarian cancer types combined."
12 Dr. Siemiatycki?		12 And about five lines up from the
13 MS. PARFITT: We are not. Chris		13 bottom on that page 40, there is a
14 and I are here with Dr. Siemiatycki.		14 reference in the sentence that states, "As
15 Patrick is in his own office.		15 implied in Table 2, all of the RRs in
16 MS. DAVIDSON: Got it. And are you		16 Figure 1 are to be left of the null value
17 going to go on the camera?		17 of 1.0." Dr. Siemiatycki meant to put
18 MS. PARFITT: Yes, I'm happy to.		18 right.
19 Sure.		19 It's interesting, Jessica, if you
20 MS. DAVIDSON: Usually we're all on		20 go back to his 2021 deposition, it was
21 the camera.		21 corrected, and then somehow -- and a page
22 MS. PARFITT: No problem. No		22 substituted, but somehow the error found
23 problem.		23 its way back into the 2023 report. So
24 MS. DAVIDSON: I want to see your		24 that is the correction we wish to make.
25 pretty face.		25 MS. DAVIDSON: I still have to go

1 like this to remember what's the left and 2 what's the right. 3 MS. PARFITT: Okay. All right. 4 Fair enough. Thank you. I appreciate 5 that everyone. 6 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Are you ready 7 to get started? 8 MS. PARFITT: Please. Thank you. 9 EXAMINATION 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Good morning, Dr. Siemiatycki. 12 A. Good morning, Ms. Davidson. 13 Q. Did I pronounce your name more Or 14 less correctly? 15 A. You did a very good job. 16 Q. Okay. Great. 17 Did you bring any materials with 18 you to the deposition today? 19 A. Oh, I brought some binders of all 20 of the material that was in my bibliography and 21 my written report. And a few scattered 22 articles that hadn't been in the binders but 23 that I wanted to have around, and I -- I have a 24 few -- there are a few articles that I printed 25 that I think are in the binders as well; so	Page 10 1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki -- 3 MS. PARFITT: Yes. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you have notes 7 on any of these documents? 8 A. I have scribbles on some -- some of 9 the articles and some of the documents. 10 Q. Okay. 11 A. I don't have standalone handwritten 12 documents of any sort or commentaries. 13 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, we'd like 14 to have those scribbles produced. I think 15 we're still waiting also for the 16 Clarke-Pearson ones that we had asked for 17 at the end of his deposition. 18 So if you could get those both to 19 us together, that would be great. 20 MS. PARFITT: I will make a note -- 21 I will make a note of that, Jessica, 22 absolutely. What we'll do after the 23 deposition is, if you don't mind when I 24 get back, take them with me and we'll have 25 copies made in DC and send them off to
Page 11 1 they are duplicate copies. 2 Otherwise, I have a copy -- copies 3 of my report, including a version that 4 compares -- sort of a compared documents with 5 the previous version of my report. 6 Q. I'm sorry. I'm not sure I 7 understand what you're saying. 8 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, may I help 9 on that? 10 MS. DAVIDSON: That would be great. 11 MS. PARFITT: Okay. What he has is 12 another report, which would be the date 13 November 15, '23; but what it does, it 14 highlights -- blue or red, I'm not sure 15 what color. It highlights the changes 16 from his earlier report of June 30th, '21. 17 So what it does it -- 18 MS. DAVIDSON: It's a redline that 19 you prepared for him? 20 MS. PARFITT: Yes, yes. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: But it's a 22 computer-generated redline not like a 23 handwritten -- 24 MS. PARFITT: Oh, no, no, no. 25	Page 11 1 you. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: Great. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, did you review 5 your prior two depositions to prepare for 6 today? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Is there anything you would change 9 in those two prior depositions? 10 MS. PARFITT: Objection to form. 11 THE WITNESS: No, not that I 12 recall. 13 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 14 Q. Okay. And you met with Ms. Parfitt 15 and Mr. Tisi to prepare? 16 A. I'm sorry? 17 Q. You met with Ms. Parfitt and 18 Mr. Tisi to prepare for this deposition? 19 A. We met yesterday. 20 Q. Was that the only time you met to 21 prepare for this deposition? 22 A. We -- we had a couple of Zoom 23 discussions in the last few weeks, I think 24 maybe a cumulative two hours maybe or something 25 like that of discussion mainly about the

4 (Pages 10 - 13)

Page 14	Page 16
1 process, but yeah.	1 documents he reviewed, and we didn't get
2 Q. You're not supposed to tell me what	2 an updated reliance list.
3 you talked about.	3 So if there are new documents that
4 So you had two meetings on Zoom and	4 he's reviewed since he's submitted his
5 one live yesterday?	5 report, that's all I'm asking. I'm
6 A. That's my recollection at the	6 entitled to know what they are.
7 moment, yeah.	7 Dr. Siemiatycki says he has
8 Q. And did they show you any documents	8 documents in front of him that aren't on
9 that were not on your materials considered	9 his reliance list. We have to know what
10 list?	10 those are to proceed.
11 A. There was one --	11 MS. PARFITT: What he have in front
12 MS. PARFITT: Dr. Siemiatycki,	12 of him are not the reliance materials. He
13 you're not to identify what it is. The	13 has and you were provided, I believe three
14 question is whether or not you were shown	14 days ago, a Dropbox. Patrick Lyons made
15 any documents not on your materials	15 sure that was secured and sent to all of
16 considered list.	16 you, which is a Dropbox of any materials
17 THE WITNESS: Yes, yes.	17 he may have considered or not, meaning
18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:	18 considered and read them, considered and
19 Q. Okay. Do you have any documents	19 read part of them.
20 with you today that are not on your material	20 That was made available in advance
21 considered list?	21 of this deposition. So what you should
22 A. Yes.	22 have is a Dropbox; and Jessica, that
23 Q. What is that?	23 should have been forwarded to you.
24 A. Am I supposed to answer that	24 MS. DAVIDSON: All right. Let's go
25 question?	25 off the record for a minute, and let me
Page 15	Page 17
1 Q. Yes.	1 figure this out; and I'll be back in two
2 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, what we can	2 minutes.
3 do -- again, there's -- there's	3 (Discussion held off the record.)
4 duplicative -- I guess it's a little bit	4 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go back on the
5 more complex. Some of the ones on his	5 record.
6 materials considered are documents that he	6 THE WITNESS: So one is the
7 would pull out for you right now.	7 National Cancer Institute PDQ on
8 I think it's probably going to be	8 ovarian/fallopian tumors.
9 very difficult for him to discern sitting	9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:
10 here today. You can -- we can make them	10 Q. Okay. Uh-huh.
11 all available to you. There's nothing new	11 A. I think that -- that was not on my
12 that you haven't seen.	12 list, but I'm not sure if it's in the Dropbox.
13 If there is during the course of	13 And another is a report from EPA, I
14 this, we can talk about it, but I'm not	14 think, a news release from EPA called
15 sure he's going to be able to discern	15 "Biden-Harris Administration Finalizes Ban on
16 what's in the materials considered list,	16 Ongoing Uses of Asbestos."
17 part of his bibliography produced prior to	17 MS. PARFITT: Yes, that one.
18 in a Dropbox his '21 deposition, and those	18 THE WITNESS: This one? Yes.
19 that Patrick Lyons sent to all of you in a	19 The report by Longo from 2023
20 Dropbox of materials that he's continued	20 called, "Third MDL Supplemental Report."
21 to review but not necessarily are reliance	21 That's enough.
22 materials because, obviously, those	22 Some of it's -- it's in the list.
23 opinions are contained in the '23 report.	23 An article called -- by Kim, K-I-M,
24 MS. DAVIDSON: I think we're	24 is the first author, Chang, Kwon, and
25 entitled before we depose him to know what	25 Myong, called, "Asbestos Exposure and

1 Ovarian Cancer, a Meta-Analysis," 2 published in '23, 2023. 3 MS. PARFITT: You have to read this 4 into the record. 5 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Sorry. 6 I'm not sure which ones. 7 Davis article is -- did you see the 8 editorials in this pile? 9 MS. PARFITT: He has also the 10 Harlow, Cramer editorials to the O'Brien, 11 which again should have been -- 12 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. 13 Could you say that again? 14 He also has... 15 MS. DAVIDSON: The Gossett, the 16 Gossett editorial. 17 MS. PARFITT: That's on his list. 18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 19 MS. PARFITT: But in addition to 20 that, he has the -- the Harlow, Cramer 21 editorials, letters to the editorial by 22 O'Brien as well. I don't know whether 23 they were in the '21 box or the '23 box, 24 but he has those in front of him as well. 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.	Page 18 1 the talc MDL litigation. 2 Does that sound about right to you? 3 A. I get -- if you got that 4 information from Ms. Parfitt, then the 5 information's correct. 6 Q. I assume you have some general 7 sense of what you've been paid in your mind. 8 Is it around \$241,000? 9 A. Yeah. I mean, we're going back a 10 few -- about three or four years or something 11 like that. Yes, I -- I think that is sounds 12 about right. 13 Q. Okay. And you also got paid for 14 state court litigation. 15 Do you know how much in total -- 16 you also were paid for your role in some state 17 court talc cases. 18 Do you know how much you have made 19 in total from talc litigation? 20 A. I'm not sure what that refers to, 21 the "state court." 22 MS. PARFITT: May -- may I help, 23 again, Jessica, to move it along? 24 MS. DAVIDSON: Sure. 25 MS. PARFITT: You testified in
Page 19 1 THE WITNESS: The Savant article. 2 MS. PARFITT: The Savant article on 3 inflammation, he has that in front of him. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: And it's your belief 5 that these were not in the Dropbox? 6 MS. PARFITT: We'll check. 7 8 MS. DAVIDSON: We'll compare this 9 to our list. 10 MS. PARFITT: Yeah. We can do 11 that. And, Jessica, if there's a question 12 about anything, let us know. But you -- I 13 just want to keep moving forward. 14 MS. DAVIDSON: Is that all of them? 15 MS. PARFITT: Yeah. Is there 16 anything else, Doctor? 17 THE WITNESS: That's all that I can 18 identify quickly. I think that's all of 19 them; otherwise, they're a binder with 20 materials that -- 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. Have been previously disclosed? 23 A. Yeah. 24 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, according to my 25 math, you have been paid \$241,000 to date in	Page 21 1 Echeverria, a state court case, and she's 2 asking -- 3 MS. DAVIDSON: And Oules. 4 MS. PARFITT: -- and Oules. Thank 5 you. 6 And she's asking whether or not you 7 have any recollection. If you do -- your 8 invoices were submitted in the past. 9 She's asking -- 10 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I -- I don't 11 recall -- I don't recall at this time. 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. So you have no sense of 14 approximately how much money you have earned to 15 date in talc litigation in total? 16 A. I -- I don't have a point estimate, 17 but I guess I could give a minimum/maximum kind 18 of range. 19 Q. What's that? 20 A. I would say between 200,000 and 21 400,000. 22 Q. Well, we know you already got 241 23 from federal court, and there's two other 24 cases. 25 A. Okay.

Page 22	Page 24
1 Q. So it would be a lot more than 200. 2 A. I am estimating that the extra bit 3 that you were talking about. 4 Q. Oh. So you're saying that in 5 total, it was somewhere between 400 and -- 6 MS. PARFITT: No. That's not -- 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. -- and 600? 9 MS. PARFITT: No. 10 MS. DAVIDSON: No. That is what he 11 said. Michelle, don't interrupt. 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, I think you were 14 saying that was the additional. 15 So are you estimating that in 16 addition to 241,000, you received another 17 200,000? 18 A. I mean, I wouldn't contest that, 19 but I -- I can't confirm it either. 20 Q. Okay. Do you have an estimate of 21 how much you have earned in total from talc 22 litigation? 23 A. No. 24 Q. So whether it was 300, 400, 500, 25 you don't know?	1 currently have full-time employment? 2 A. I'm retired from university. 3 Q. When did you retire? 4 A. 2021. 5 Q. And other than your -- do you have 6 a pension? 7 A. Yes, I do. 8 Q. Other than your pension and your 9 talc earnings, do you have any other earnings? 10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 11 You're not entitled to all his other 12 sources of revenue, Jessica. 13 MS. DAVIDSON: Well, we're trying 14 to understand what percentage of his 15 income is. 16 MS. PARFITT: He has indicated he 17 can't provide that. 18 MS. DAVIDSON: I understand. 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. But, Dr. Siemiatycki, do you have 21 any other source of income other than your 22 pension and the talc earnings? 23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. You're 24 not entitled to other forms of his income. 25 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm not asking for
Page 23	Page 25
1 A. Right now, no. I mean, I -- I 2 would have to look it up. 3 Q. What percentage of your income has 4 talc litigation been over the last several 5 years? 6 A. I have to do some arithmetic and 7 estimate what my total revenue income has been. 8 So we're going back to 2015, so near eight or 9 nine years; is that right? 2016, I think. 10 So I'd have to figure out what is 11 my total income and then what the talc part of 12 it would be. It -- it would take me more than 13 a couple of minutes to do that. 14 Q. So you can't tell me, sitting here 15 today, what percentage of your income this 400 16 or so thousand dollars would have been? 17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 18 answered. 19 THE WITNESS: No, I can't. Not -- 20 not sitting here this moment. I could if 21 I took time. I could take 15 or 22 20 minutes, go off the record maybe, or 23 whatever what you like. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Are you currently -- are you	1 the amounts. 2 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 3 Q. You can answer the question. 4 MS. PARFITT: You just asked for 5 it. I object to him divulging other forms 6 of income. You're not entitled to that. 7 It's irrelevant. 8 THE WITNESS: If I'm not obliged to 9 divulge all of my sources of income, then 10 I'd prefer not to. 11 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 12 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, is your pension 13 and your talc earnings the bulk of your income 14 for the last several years? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: I guess it's part of 17 the same answer. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. You are -- that is a legitimate 20 question, Doctor. You can't choose what to 21 answer and what not to answer today, with all 22 due respect. 23 Is your pension and your talc 24 earnings the majority of your income over the 25 last several of years?

Page 26	Page 28
1 A. By "majority, "you mean 50 percent 2 or what? 3 Q. Well, let's start with 50 percent. 4 Is your pension and your talc 5 earnings more than 50 percent of your earnings 6 in the last several years? 7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. Is it more than 75? 11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 12 THE WITNESS: I -- yes. 13 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 14 Q. And despite the fact that your talc 15 earnings are such a substantial portion of your 16 income, you can't remember sitting here today 17 how much you've earned from the talc 18 litigation? 19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 20 answered. 21 Let's move on, Jessica. I think 22 you've got your answers. 23 THE WITNESS: No. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Are you retained in any other	1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. The 2 question -- you're entitled to ask whether 3 he's been retained as an expert in a case, 4 and he's answered. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Have you served in some other role 7 in litigation other than being an expert? 8 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 9 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure if I 10 should answer. 11 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 12 Q. Yes, you should answer it. The 13 objection's are for the record. 14 MS. PARFITT: The objection is: 15 You are entitled to get information about 16 where he has been retained as an expert. 17 That's it. 18 If someone's talked to him, if 19 someone's consulted with him, you're not 20 entitled to that. 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. Okay. I'm not asking for 23 consulting. 24 I'm asking if you have been 25 retained in litigation in some other capacity
Page 27	Page 29
1 litigation at the time -- at the current time? 2 MS. PARFITT: As an expert? 3 THE WITNESS: As an expert, you 4 mean? No. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Have you been retained as an expert 7 in any other litigation since 2021? 8 A. There was a Canadian case, but I 9 think that was before 2021. I think that was 10 mentioned in my report, and I don't remember 11 what the date was. 12 Q. What did that case involve? 13 A. It's a similar case. It's a 14 litigation on behalf of women with ovarian 15 cancer in Canada. 16 Q. Right. I'm asking have you been 17 retained in any litigation other than talc in 18 the last several years? 19 A. Oh, other than talc. Not -- I -- 20 I've -- 21 MS. PARFITT: As an expert. 22 THE WITNESS: As an expert, no. 23 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 24 Q. Have you been retained in another 25 capacity in litigation?	1 other than as an expert. 2 A. Only as consultant or -- 3 Q. Okay. 4 A. -- exploring possibility of 5 participation in cases. 6 Q. But none of that ended up in your 7 being disclosed as an expert? 8 A. No, not since 2021, I don't think. 9 Q. Okay. And do you still do any work 10 at McGill or University of Montreal? 11 A. I do some work. I still have 12 students in the -- sort of going through to the 13 Ph.D. I still do research and publish and 14 acknowledge my university affiliations when I 15 do that, but I don't -- I don't have a presence 16 on campus. 17 Q. Now, were you an adjunct, or -- 18 were you an adjunct professor at McGill and 19 University of Montreal? 20 A. I was a full professor at 21 University of Montreal -- 22 Q. Oh, okay. 23 A. -- and a adjunct professor at 24 McGill University. 25 Q. Got it. So your -- your pension
	8 (Pages 26 - 29)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 comes from University of Montreal, not McGill?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Got it. Okay.</p> <p>4 Have you authored any publications</p> <p>5 concerning talc and ovarian cancer since</p> <p>6 September 2021?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you a coauthor on a paper</p> <p>9 called Leung?</p> <p>10 A. Called what?</p> <p>11 Q. L-E-U-N-G?</p> <p>12 A. Oh, yeah. Lisa Leung, yeah.</p> <p>13 Q. Was that published in September</p> <p>14 2021?</p> <p>15 A. I'd have to look that up.</p> <p>16 Q. That's okay. If you don't know,</p> <p>17 that's fine?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah. If you have it on my CV as</p> <p>19 September '21, then that's correct.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you disclose in that paper that</p> <p>21 you are plaintiff's expert in the talc</p> <p>22 litigation?</p> <p>23 A. I don't recall --</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Let's get the paper</p> <p>25 in front of him.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you have a policy of disclosing</p> <p>3 in any papers related to talc that you are an</p> <p>4 expert for plaintiffs in this litigation?</p> <p>5 A. I am not sure what you mean by</p> <p>6 "have a policy." I don't have any sort of</p> <p>7 strictly written, notarized policy, but I do</p> <p>8 disclose and I would disclose in any</p> <p>9 publications that concern talc and</p> <p>10 carcinogenicity that I am -- I have been an</p> <p>11 expert in litigation.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know, sitting here today,</p> <p>13 why the Leung paper does not include such a</p> <p>14 disclosure?</p> <p>15 A. I'd have to look at the article,</p> <p>16 see what it was about, and see what the --</p> <p>17 whether it was relevant to disclose that.</p> <p>18 Q. Have you published your views --</p> <p>19 other than the Leung paper, have you written</p> <p>20 anything about talc or asbestos since September</p> <p>21 2021?</p> <p>22 A. I don't recall now. I'd have to</p> <p>23 look at my CV.</p> <p>24 Q. Have you made any public statements</p> <p>25 concerning talc and ovarian cancer since 2021?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let -- yes.</p> <p>2 Let me get the --</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. Do you recall whether --</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, this is my</p> <p>6 deposition.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you recall</p> <p>9 whether you disclosed in that paper that you</p> <p>10 are plaintiff's expert in the talc litigation?</p> <p>11 A. No. I --</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: He can answer the</p> <p>13 question when he has the article in front</p> <p>14 of him.</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: I asked if he</p> <p>16 recalls. He doesn't need the paper for</p> <p>17 that, Michelle.</p> <p>18 Michelle, I have four hours here</p> <p>19 today. Please don't interrupt this</p> <p>20 deposition, or I'll have to go to the</p> <p>21 Court and ask for more hours.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you recall</p> <p>24 whether you disclosed that you are an expert in</p> <p>25 the talc litigation in that paper?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 A. I don't recall; but again, looking</p> <p>2 at my CV might refresh my memory about</p> <p>3 something, but I don't think I did.</p> <p>4 Q. Are you currently working on any</p> <p>5 articles or studies pertaining to talc or</p> <p>6 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>7 A. Well, there is an intention to</p> <p>8 write -- to do an analysis of perineal talc</p> <p>9 exposure in the context of a case control study</p> <p>10 that my colleague has carried out in Montreal,</p> <p>11 and I would be involved in that article. So</p> <p>12 it -- there's an intention for that to happen.</p> <p>13 It's not currently ongoing yet.</p> <p>14 Q. I'm sorry. I don't understand.</p> <p>15 You have an intention to publish a</p> <p>16 new case control study on talc and ovarian</p> <p>17 cancer?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And has the research begun on that?</p> <p>20 A. Has the research what?</p> <p>21 Q. Begun on that?</p> <p>22 A. The research began ten years ago,</p> <p>23 so this is a study that was carried out by my</p> <p>24 colleague, Anita Koushik, as the principal</p> <p>25 investigator. I was at the time involved as</p>

9 (Pages 30 - 33)

Page 34	Page 36
1 kind of mentor in helping her get funding and 2 designing the study and designing the fieldwork 3 procedures. 4 And the questionnaire that she 5 developed included questions about perineal 6 talc exposure, and the intention -- her 7 intention was always to do an analysis of that 8 data and publish it. 9 Q. Do you know why it hasn't yet been 10 published? 11 A. Well -- 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 13 THE WITNESS: -- she had other 14 priorities that were, in part, driven by 15 the principal hypotheses of stated in her 16 grant application and the funding agency. 17 And those were sort of in chronological 18 priority list. 19 It started probably around 2017 or 20 '18 that the data became available to be 21 analyzed. It takes -- of course, a study 22 that was funded around 2008 or '9, didn't 23 complete the fieldwork and collection of 24 data probably for about five years after 25 that.	1 know how -- it'll -- whether it'll be accepted 2 in first iteration or, you know, three 3 iterations of comments from editors and 4 reviewers and so on and so forth. 5 So when it's going to come out is 6 not under the control of the authors and the 7 investigators. You can control when you're 8 going to submit the paper for -- to a journal. 9 Given that the analyses have not 10 yet been carried out, unless she has started 11 without my knowledge in the last couple of 12 months, and that the writing of the manuscript 13 has not started, I guess it wouldn't happen 14 before manuscript wouldn't be ready for 15 submission before the fall of this year. 16 Q. Have you seen the data yet? 17 MS. PARFITT: Seen what? 18 MS. DAVIDSON: The data. 19 THE WITNESS: No, not on talc 20 exposure. 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. Okay. Have you done any outreach 23 to any health organizations, any public health 24 organizations about talc use and ovarian cancer 25 since 2021?
Page 35	Page 37
1 And then getting started with 2 analyses and drafting of papers depended 3 on her priorities and the interests of her 4 students who were the, typically, the 5 first authors of the eventual paper. 6 So she has now -- they have now 7 published -- I don't know -- four or five 8 papers, I think, that have come out of 9 that study. They haven't yet published 10 anything about perineal talc exposure, and 11 my understanding is that that is coming 12 up. I don't know if it's next on the list 13 or -- she's also recently moved from one 14 university to another and had disruptions 15 of that sort in her life. 16 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 17 Q. When is -- when is the last time 18 you discussed this paper -- potential paper 19 with her? 20 A. A couple of months ago, I would 21 say. Maybe December or January. 22 Q. And when do you expect it to come 23 out? 24 A. To come out? You never know when a 25 paper is going to come out because you never	1 A. Well, I -- I had reached out to 2 Health Canada when they put out a call for or 3 opinions and input on their proposed report, 4 but I -- it might have been before 2021 or in 5 2020 or something in that ballpark. 6 Q. Since Health Canada, my question 7 is: Have you reached out to any public health 8 organizations about talc use and ovarian 9 cancer? 10 A. Any public health organization? 11 No. It's -- it's not my practice 12 to reach out to public health organizations 13 about research issues. 14 Q. Are you familiar with an 15 organization called ACOG? 16 A. I'm familiar with it. I'm not a 17 member of it, and I haven't participated in any 18 way. 19 Q. Do you know whether they list talc 20 use as a risk factor for ovarian cancer? 21 A. No, I don't. 22 Q. Have you looked on their website 23 since 2021? 24 A. No, I haven't. 25 Q. Are you familiar with the Society

10 (Pages 34 - 37)

Page 38	Page 40
<p>1 of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada, 2 also known as SOGC? 3 A. No, I'm not familiar with it. 4 Q. You've never heard of SOGC? 5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 6 THE WITNESS: Nope. 7 MS. PARFITT: Asked and answered. 8 THE WITNESS: With all the acronyms 9 that fly around my desk and my brain, it 10 doesn't ring a bell. It's not the top of 11 mind. I don't know if I've -- 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. I gave it to you without the 14 acronym, actually: Society of Obstetricians 15 and Gynecologists of Canada. 16 A. I'm sure there is such a society. 17 So if you're asking me whether I'm surprised 18 that there is such a thing, no, I'm not at all 19 surprised. I would expect that there would be. 20 But I'm not familiar with it. I've 21 never been in touch with them. I've never read 22 any documents from them. It wouldn't be a 23 go-to place for me to find out about research 24 or risk factors. 25 Q. And you've never reached out to</p>	<p>1 website to see if they list talc as a risk 2 factor for ovarian cancer? 3 A. No, I haven't. 4 Q. So you're not aware that the CDC 5 does not identify talc as a risk factor for 6 ovarian cancer? 7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 8 THE WITNESS: No. I'm not aware of 9 what's on their website. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Are you familiar with the American 12 Cancer Society? 13 A. Yes, I am. 14 Q. Are you aware that the American 15 Cancer Society has stated that the weight of 16 the evidence does not support an association 17 between ovarian cancer and general exposure to 18 talc-based powder? 19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 20 THE WITNESS: I am not aware of 21 that statement that you just read. 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. Do you disagree with the American 24 Cancer Society? 25 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p>
Page 39	Page 41
<p>1 them to express your concerns about talc and 2 ovarian cancer, correct? 3 A. Correct. 4 Q. Are you familiar with the Society 5 of Gynecological Oncology in the United States, 6 also known as SGO? 7 A. Again, I'm -- I'm -- you know, I'm 8 not familiar with the particular combinations 9 of words that go into their name and the 10 acronym; but I am certain there is such a 11 society. 12 Q. That wasn't my question. 13 Doctor, you mentioned that you had 14 the NCI PDQ in front of you. 15 Have you ever reached out to NCI to 16 raise your concerns about talc and ovarian 17 cancer? 18 A. No, I haven't. 19 Q. Have you ever heard of the CDC? 20 A. Yes, I have. 21 Q. And have you ever reached out to 22 the CDC to express your concerns about talc and 23 ovarian cancer? 24 A. No, I haven't. 25 Q. Have you ever looked on the CDC</p>	<p>1 You may answer. 2 THE WITNESS: I would have to see 3 the entirety of their document and 4 their -- whatever they -- whatever they 5 include in their document to support that 6 conclusion before commenting on whether I 7 agree or disagree. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. So you might agree with their 10 statement -- is there a possibility that you 11 would agree with the statement that, "The 12 weight of the evidence does not support an 13 association between ovarian cancer and genital 14 exposure"? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: I would find it most 17 unlikely that I would disagree with it, 18 but I am open to being persuaded by 19 evidence. And if they have evidence that 20 I've never seen... 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. Who drafted the changes to your 23 2023 report? 24 A. I'm sorry? 25 Q. Who drafted the additions in your</p>

1 2023 report? 2 A. The additions? 3 Q. Uh-huh. 4 A. What -- which additions are you -- 5 Q. Do you remember you have a redline 6 in front of that shows what was added in '23? 7 Who drafted those additions? 8 A. So just to be clear, there are not 9 additions to the 2023 report. There were 10 changes to the 2021 report, and that's what is 11 redlined in sort of the correction in the 12 version that -- that I have. 13 Who drafted them? I did. 14 Q. Did you identify all the documents 15 that have been added to your reliance list and 16 put in the Dropbox and mentioned today, or were 17 some of them provided to you by the lawyers? 18 A. Some were provided by the lawyers, 19 and some I found independently. And at this 20 time I -- I mean, I've never kept a tally of 21 how I found out about different documents or 22 reports. So I couldn't really identify which 23 ones I came upon and which ones were sent to me 24 by the lawyers; but some were sent by the 25 lawyers, and some I came upon independently.	Page 42	1 I mean, I make a distinction 2 between evidence that I look at and that I 3 derive and that I hold. The opinions that I 4 hold are based on my own personal evaluation of 5 the data and the evidence as compared with 6 opinions I hold based on the authoritative 7 opinions of others that I accept. 8 Q. What documents -- well, let's go 9 back. 10 You said -- referenced EPA. 11 Has EPA ever stated that talc 12 contains asbestos? 13 A. I'm looking -- I'm looking for the 14 document on that topic. So the recent EPA 15 document -- it's in this, I think. 16 Q. Is it your recollection that that 17 document references talc? 18 A. I'm sorry? 19 Q. Is it your recollection that that 20 document references talc? 21 A. It is my recollection that there is 22 mention of asbestos in talc. 23 Q. Okay. 24 MS. PARFITT: I can shorten this 25 real quickly and point to the document. I	Page 44
1 Q. You testified in 2021 that you're 2 not offering an opinion that Johnson's Baby 3 Powder contained asbestos. 4 Is that still your position? 5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 6 Misstates his testimony. 7 THE WITNESS: I would say that I've 8 seen more evidence in the last couple of 9 years that point in the direction that 10 asbestos has been in the -- in the 11 formulations of cosmetic talc. 12 And so I would be much more 13 amenable to the opinion that there has 14 been asbestos. 15 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 16 Q. You would be more amenable to that 17 opinion, or you're offering that opinion? 18 A. I'm offering that opinion but based 19 not on my own expertise as a mineralogist or a 20 measurement scientist for asbestos, but the 21 accumulation of evidence from credible sources, 22 including EPA, FDA in the U.S. and some 23 scientists who have measured asbestos fibers in 24 talc, in historic talc preparations, make me -- 25 persuade me much more.	Page 43	1 see it in his pile. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, let -- 3 let's just let us handle this. 4 MS. PARFITT: Let me just say this, 5 and we won't have any problems. 6 If you ask him about a document and 7 he says he's looking for it, he's entitled 8 to have it in front of him. 9 I know you're moving it along, but 10 if you're going to ask him questions about 11 a document -- 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, it is very 13 clear that there is a strategy in this 14 deposition of filibustering because, you 15 know, I only have four hours. And if I 16 have to, I will go to the Court and ask 17 for more time. 18 MS. PARFITT: You're remote. I'm 19 here. 20 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm telling you -- 21 MS. PARFITT: Filibuster -- 22 MS. DAVIDSON: I will go to the 23 Court and ask for more time because 24 Dr. Siemiatycki is answering simple 25 questions --	Page 45

12 (Pages 42 - 45)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: You're not going to 2 get more -- 3 MS. DAVIDSON: You're interrupting 4 me. You're interrupting me. 5 Dr. Siemiatycki is answering simple 6 questions -- 7 MS. PARFITT: Let me finish. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: You can finish after 9 I'm finished. You will finish after I am 10 finished. 11 Dr. Siemiatycki is answering very 12 simple questions with long-winded answers 13 that he was clearly coached to do, and we 14 have very limited time. 15 MS. PARFITT: Jessica -- 16 MS. DAVIDSON: So -- 17 MS. PARFITT: -- you do not give 18 your tenor to what Dr. Siemiatycki. He's 19 here to answer your questions. Make the 20 question so he can give a good answer. 21 And, Jack, if you need look to look 22 at the articles, just tell Ms. Davidson. 23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, other than EPA and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 just talking generally. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm just telling you 3 it's a new sentence in his report. 4 MS. PARFITT: Fair enough. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, sitting here 7 today, can you recall any other documents that 8 you relied on for your opinion, which is 9 uncited in your report, that there is "growing 10 evidence that talc products may have contained 11 asbestos fibers"? 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 13 his testimony. 14 THE WITNESS: I am trying to 15 recall, and right now I can't recall 16 those. I'd have to spend a couple of 17 minutes looking through the documents. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Okay. Dr. Siemiatycki, would you 20 agree with me that it's important for a 21 scientist before reaching any sort of opinions 22 on scientific issues, to consider all the 23 relevant data? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, have you reviewed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 FDA, what other materials are you relying on 2 for your new opinion that Johnson's Baby Powder 3 contains asbestos? 4 A. A document written by Dr. Longo, 5 William Longo, November 17, 2023, which 6 included analyses of talc products, historic 7 talc products of various origins, including 8 Chinese and that -- where he demonstrated the 9 presence of asbestos fibers. 10 Q. Are there any other documents 11 you're relying on? 12 A. Well, historically, there were 13 reports from Blount about this, relying on my 14 memory. Let me look in my report and see. 15 Q. Your report doesn't actually cite 16 anything. When you say -- when you refer to, 17 quote, "Growing evidence that talc products may 18 have contained asbestos fibers," there's no 19 cite there? 20 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I'll also 21 remind you that this area was covered in 22 his prior deposition. 23 MS. DAVIDSON: It's a new sentence 24 in his report, Michelle. 25 MS. PARFITT: I understand. I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 all the documents that J&J produced in this 2 litigation about its robust testing of talc for 3 asbestos? 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 5 THE WITNESS: And I'm not sure what 6 you mean by "all the documents that J&J 7 produced." What's that -- 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. Have you reviewed all of J&J's 10 documents in which they address the robust 11 testing program for asbestos in its talc 12 products? 13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 14 I'll give you a little foundation, 15 but this area was examined as well back on 16 January 31st, '19. 17 MS. DAVIDSON: We have this new 18 statement in the report, Michelle; and 19 please stop filibustering this deposition. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you -- 22 MS. PARFITT: Stop going back in 23 history, or we will have to call the 24 judge. 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle. Michelle,</p>

13 (Pages 46 - 49)

Page 50	Page 52
1 it's been four years. He has an opinion. 2 I need to know -- 3 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, don't 4 shriek. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, I'm going to ask 7 the question again. 8 Have you reviewed the documents 9 produced by J&J addressing its robust testing 10 program for talc products? 11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 12 THE WITNESS: I remember reviewing 13 some documents from J&J about this, but I 14 don't know that this is -- was a 15 comprehensive list of documents. I mean, 16 if you -- if there are any new ones, I'd 17 be glad to look at them. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Are you aware that J&J produced 20 thousands of documents in this litigation about 21 its testing of talc for asbestos? 22 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 23 answered in his deposition January '19. 24 THE WITNESS: I'm aware they 25 produced documents about this. I don't	1 November 17th, 2023, report, Jessica? 2 We need the record to be clear. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, have you reviewed 5 any reports by Mr. Matthew Sanchez? 6 A. By who? 7 Q. Mr. Matthew Sanchez. 8 A. That does not ring a bell. 9 What would the date be on that 10 report? 11 Q. There would be multiple such 12 reports. 13 A. Roughly beginning when and ending 14 when? 15 These are from 2023 and -- 16 Q. There -- over the years there have 17 been multiple reports by Mr. Matthew Sanchez. 18 Have you reviewed any of them? 19 A. I can't recall having reviewed 20 them. 21 Q. None of them -- none of them are 22 with you here today, correct? 23 A. Correct. 24 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I need to go 25 off the record. I have a quick call, so
Page 51	Page 53
1 know if -- there were thousands. I have 2 no idea how many, and I don't know what 3 they were total. 4 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 5 Q. Have you reviewed the expert report 6 of J&J's expert who responds to Dr. Longo and 7 explains the flaws in Dr. Longo's testing? 8 A. Who would the author be of that 9 report or the timing? 10 Q. Do you recall reading any such 11 report? 12 A. I recall reading reports from a -- 13 reports from experts for J&J about this, but I 14 don't know if it's the one -- the reports that 15 you have in mind. I don't know. 16 Q. Have you reviewed the expert report 17 from J&J's microscopist? 18 A. I have not recently, but I have. 19 Q. Did you review the report that 20 J&J's microscopist submitted in response to the 21 Longo report you mentioned a few minutes ago? 22 MS. PARFITT: You're talking about 23 the '23 Longo report, for clarity because 24 there's two or many actually? 25 Are you referring to the	1 let's take a five-minute break. 2 MS. PARFITT: Okay. Thank you. 3 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 4 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 5 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, other than the 6 materials that you were provided by plaintiff's 7 counsels, did you undertake any research on 8 your own regarding potential asbestos 9 contamination in Johnson's Baby Powder? 10 A. I'm not sure if I would 11 characterize it as having undertaken 12 independent research on my own; but when I was 13 reading the various documents that I did have, 14 I would sometimes look at references in those 15 documents that may -- that were not submitted 16 to me by -- by the plaintiff's lawyers. 17 But I can't remember if that 18 occurred with this topic, with the topic of 19 asbestos in talc products. But as a general 20 rule, I would explore, read a document; and 21 there may be sort of a stimulus there to look 22 at something else. 23 Q. Well, today you mentioned an EPA 24 document, an FDA document, Dr. Longo, and 25 Dr. Blount.

14 (Pages 50 - 53)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 Fair to say all those materials 2 were provided to you by plaintiff's counsel? 3 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 4 Asked and answered. 5 THE WITNESS: So the -- I think 6 originally the Blount articles -- and I'm 7 having trouble remembering all the names, 8 but there was another early article from 9 the late -- late '70s or early '80s that 10 addressed the detection of asbestos 11 particles in talc products. Those were 12 provided originally by the lawyers. 13 The FDA analyses, I'm not sure 14 whether information about that was 15 provided by the lawyers or if I saw that 16 in another report. So I'm a little bit 17 fuzzy on the historical origin of how I 18 came to know those documents.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Was the EPA document provided to 21 you by the plaintiff's lawyers?</p> <p>22 A. Yeah. So the EPA document is the 23 recent ban on asbestos, which does not, in 24 fact, concern talc. I just had a look at it 25 directly. It doesn't explicitly concern talc,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 You may answer, Dr. Siemiatycki. 2 THE WITNESS: I -- I have read 3 references to the to the detection of 4 metals in talc products. I -- I can't 5 say. It certainly not something that I'm 6 relying upon for any opinions about talc, 7 but it's something that I have read.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, did you reach out 10 to IARC and offer yourself as a potential 11 expert on talc issues recently?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>13 Q. When was that?</p> <p>14 A. Probably a year ago or nine months 15 ago. It was following a call by IARC for 16 experts to volunteer to participate in a new 17 monograph evaluation of talc, and I thought I 18 might be useful to them; and I've had a long 19 association with IARC. So I -- I did offer 20 myself in that context.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you tell the lawyers you were 22 going to do that?</p> <p>23 A. I don't think I told them before 24 doing it. I can't remember at what point I 25 informed them about it. Maybe only after I had</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 but it concerns one of the products that has 2 been detected in talc products, one of them. 3 Q. So, in fact, the EPA document does 4 not support your new opinion that talc 5 contained asbestos, correct?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 7 his testimony entirely.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: That's correct. I 9 would say that's correct, basically.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And the Dr. Longo documents 12 were provided to you by plaintiff's counsel as 13 well, of course?</p> <p>14 A. Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>16 Are you offering an opinion on 17 heavy metals in this litigation?</p> <p>18 A. What do you mean by "an opinion on 19 heavy metals"?</p> <p>20 Q. Are you offering an opinion that 21 talc contained -- that Johnson's Baby Powder 22 contained heavy metals?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Objection to the 24 extent it's foundational. It was covered 25 in his 2019 deposition.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 learned that IARC was not going to invite me, 2 but we didn't have a discussion about that.</p> <p>3 Q. And the reason -- and the reason 4 they didn't include you is because of your 5 conflict of interest as a plaintiff's expert, 6 right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right, which --</p> <p>8 Q. And --</p> <p>9 A. -- I admitted to them front and 10 center when I made my -- when I offered my 11 services.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you provide plaintiffs to 13 produce to us the letter you submitted to IARC 14 with your application, so to speak?</p> <p>15 A. Can you -- can you repeat that?</p> <p>16 Q. Your application to IARC, was it 17 some sort of letter?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, it was a letter. And I think 19 accompanying the letter, there was a form, 20 actually, explicitly asking the applicant to 21 list any potential conflicts of interest.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, has that 23 been produced to us because we couldn't 24 find it?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: It was. It was. And</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 Patrick can confirm that.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. All right.</p> <p>3 MR. LYONS: Yeah. It's in the --</p> <p>4 it's in the Dropbox.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>6 MR. LYONS: It's labeled "Letter to</p> <p>7 IARC on Monograph 136."</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. I don't know</p> <p>9 why we didn't find that it.</p> <p>10 Noah, please find that and make</p> <p>11 sure we have it.</p> <p>12 Noah will make sure we have it</p> <p>13 before the day is over.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Dr. Siemiatycki, you're</p> <p>16 aware that Dr. Woolen found a 1.47 risk ratio</p> <p>17 for frequent talc use, right?</p> <p>18 A. For what?</p> <p>19 Q. Dr. Woolen found a 1.47 risk ratio</p> <p>20 between her definition of frequent talc use and</p> <p>21 the development of ovarian cancer, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Does that mean that if a woman used</p> <p>24 perineal talc frequently and developed ovarian</p> <p>25 cancer, 47 percent of the cause of that ovarian</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 chance of developing ovarian cancer was 1.47</p> <p>2 times greater than the risk for a non user.</p> <p>3 It can also be restated -- it can</p> <p>4 also be restated that her chance of getting</p> <p>5 ovarian cancer was 47 percent higher than for</p> <p>6 non users, but that's not an optimal way to</p> <p>7 actually present a risk ratio or a relative</p> <p>8 risk; but that is sometimes expressed that way.</p> <p>9 But not in the percentage terms</p> <p>10 that you indicated in your question.</p> <p>11 Q. Are you aware that IARC and NCI</p> <p>12 issued a report called "Expert Consensus on</p> <p>13 Future Directions for Ovarian Cancer Research"?</p> <p>14 A. What would be the date</p> <p>15 approximately? The year?</p> <p>16 I'm not sure what you're talking</p> <p>17 about.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, if you</p> <p>19 have a copy of that document, perhaps you</p> <p>20 could share it.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. I'm asking if you're familiar with</p> <p>23 the document entitled "IARC and NCI Expert</p> <p>24 Consensus on Future Directions for Ovarian</p> <p>25 Cancer Research."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 cancer would have been her talc use?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I'm -- I'm</p> <p>4 not following your algebra.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Well, I'm asking you if that</p> <p>7 makes -- I'm asking you.</p> <p>8 A. Yes. I understand, but I don't</p> <p>9 understand what your asking me.</p> <p>10 Q. I'm asking you if somebody is a</p> <p>11 frequent user of talc and then develops ovarian</p> <p>12 cancer, can the risk ratio in Woolen be turned</p> <p>13 into an absolute risk such that you can say</p> <p>14 that 47 percent of this woman's cancer</p> <p>15 causation relates to ex- -- perineal talc</p> <p>16 exposure?</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Objection to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. And why is that?</p> <p>21 A. Because that's not the meaning of</p> <p>22 relative risk.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you explain?</p> <p>24 A. The relative risk of 1.47 means</p> <p>25 that for a woman who was a frequent user, her</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 A. What year approximately?</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, what year is</p> <p>3 it?</p> <p>4 MR. EPSTEIN: 2021.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: 2021.</p> <p>6 MR. EPSTEIN: Do you want me to put</p> <p>7 it in the chat?</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Not right now.</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Oh, so you don't want</p> <p>10 to put it in the chat; so you don't want</p> <p>11 the doctor to --</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: I just want to know</p> <p>13 if Dr. Siemiatycki is familiar with this</p> <p>14 document, if he read it before, if it</p> <p>15 sounds familiar.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: No, I haven't seen</p> <p>17 it.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>20 How would you extrapolate from</p> <p>21 these epi studies to determine what a women's</p> <p>22 absolute risk is for ovarian cancer from</p> <p>23 perineal talc use?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>25 You can answer.</p>

16 (Pages 58 - 61)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: You mean technically, 2 like the algebraic formula that is used to 3 do that?</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. How is it done? 6 I'm just asking generally how it's 7 done.</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Well, it's sort of a 10 combination of the relative risk and the 11 incidence of the disease in the 12 population. Combining those parameters, 13 you can -- you can figure out the absolute 14 risk due to the exposure.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Have you done that for talc and 17 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>18 A. No, I haven't.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you done a systematic review 20 of the literature related to asbestos and 21 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>22 A. Have I personally done one?</p> <p>23 Q. Yes.</p> <p>24 A. No, I haven't.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know how much exposure to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 not -- I'm not aware.</p> <p>2 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>3 Q. Were you aware that the -- 4 MS. PARFITT: Let him finish.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Maybe -- maybe if you 6 tell me who the senior author is.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Are you aware that the 9 Woolen paper grew out of a meta-analysis that 10 was actually done for purposes of this 11 litigation?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 13 the evidence in the case.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not aware of 15 that.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know how the Woolen authors 18 chose two times a week as their definition of 19 frequent use?</p> <p>20 A. It may be mentioned in the paper. 21 I certainly don't remember it. But 22 establishing cutpoints for continuous variables 23 has an element of arbitrariness always and you 24 typically look for -- if it's a meta-analysis, 25 which this is, you're probably looking for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 asbestos is needed to cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. Are you aware that one of the 6 authors of Woolen is a plaintiff's expert in 7 this litigation?</p> <p>8 A. Am I aware that one of the authors 9 of the Woolen paper is an expert for the 10 plaintiffs; is that what you're asking?</p> <p>11 Q. That is.</p> <p>12 A. Let me look at the article.</p> <p>13 Q. Without looking at the article, you 14 can't tell me whether one of the authors is an 15 expert?</p> <p>16 A. There are 200 articles in my piles, 17 and each one has about ten authors; and I don't 18 remember all the authors on all the papers.</p> <p>19 So --</p> <p>20 Q. You don't -- you don't recall 21 whether the Woolen paper -- whether the senior 22 author on the Woolen paper is a plaintiff's 23 expert in this litigation?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware -- I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 cutpoints that have been used by the original 2 authors of the original studies. And so you're 3 a little bit at the mercy of what has been done 4 previously, and you're also trying to look for 5 cutpoints that make sense to you as a cutpoint 6 for the parameter that you're looking for, 7 which is frequency of use.</p> <p>8 But in this particular case, I 9 don't recall.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you check -- when you reviewed 11 Woolen, did you check whether the risk ratios 12 the authors used were actually for 13 two-times-a-week use?</p> <p>14 A. Sorry. Did -- was -- did I check 15 whether --</p> <p>16 Q. Whether the risk ratios used in the 17 Woolen paper actually reflected 18 two-times-a-week use?</p> <p>19 A. No, I didn't. But coincidentally, 20 I carried out an analysis myself along the 21 lines of what's in the Woolen paper some years 22 before they did, and it's in my report. And, 23 in fact, there's a table in my report -- I 24 think it's Table 8 in my report -- which 25 describes my own meta-analysis on that topic</p>

17 (Pages 62 - 65)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 and the studies that I used that I found in the 2 literature to address the question and the 3 relative risk estimates that I used 4 independently of Woolen. 5 As I said, I did it years before 6 they did, came out quite close to the relative 7 risk estimates that they used in their 8 analysis; and my bottom-line result came out 9 very close to theirs. I think the 10 meta-relative risk in my analysis of the high 11 frequency users was 1.39 with a confidence 12 interval that easily included the 1.47 relative 13 risk estimate in the Woolen paper. 14 So the two analyses carried out 15 completely independently of each other, 16 basically, found the same raw material to 17 analyze, carried out the analysis in similar 18 ways and found almost exactly the same 19 bottom-line result.</p> <p>20 Q. How many of the studies overlapped 21 between the two papers?</p> <p>22 A. I'm sorry. How many?</p> <p>23 Q. How many of the studies overlapped 24 between your meta-analysis and hers?</p> <p>25 A. I didn't count them, but they</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 2 THE WITNESS: Do I know -- right 3 now sitting here, no; but if you told me 4 of another study, I might recognize it. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. And one difference between your 7 paper and the Woolen paper is that she used 8 NHS-1 data right they used NHS-1 data, right? 9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 10 THE WITNESS: I -- maybe. Maybe 11 that's a distinction. I used O'Brien, I 12 believe; and if they used NHS-1, then that 13 would be a difference. 14 I did not use NHS. I used 15 O'Brien -- 16 MS. DAVIDSON: Turn to Table 1. 17 MS. PARFITT: Wait, Jessica. He's 18 finishing his statement. Let him finish. 19 THE WITNESS: I'm just 20 confirming -- 21 MS. DAVIDSON: He's answering a 22 question I didn't ask. 23 MS. PARFITT: Yes. Let him finish. 24 THE WITNESS: So I used -- you were 25 asking about studies that overlapped and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 almost all do. 2 Q. Okay. 3 A. I think there was one -- 4 Q. Okay. 5 MS. PARFITT: Let him finish. 6 THE WITNESS: I think one exception 7 was that, if I remember correctly, I 8 included the Terry analysis -- the Terry 9 paper as one of the components. 10 Sorry. I'm just verifying that 11 that is the case. 12 Oh, no. I included the Terry 13 analysis in my Table 6, which is an 14 analogous meta-analysis, but for 15 cumulative exposure not frequency of 16 exposure. 17 So the frequency of use, which is 18 the same parameter that Woolen used -- I 19 mean, I can list the studies, but they 20 were almost identical with the ones that 21 they used. 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. Do you know whether there have been 24 other meta-analyses that defined frequency of 25 use different than two times a week?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 whether I used NHS data, and I'm just 2 trying to answer that question. I did not 3 use NHS. 4 I used the superior data, which is 5 in the O'Brien study, which involved a 6 longer period of follow-up and larger 7 number of cases. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. Where did Woolen get the NHS data? 10 A. I'm sorry? 11 Q. Do you know where Woolen got her -- 12 where the Woolen authors got their NHS-1 data? 13 A. Off the top, no. I could look up 14 the article and try to find it, but I -- I 15 don't recall. 16 Q. Do you recall that they limited 17 their NHS-1 data to patent women? 18 A. I don't recall specifically, but it 19 doesn't surprise me. 20 Q. Can we look -- 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, can you put up 22 on the screen Table 1 of Woolen, which we 23 just marked as Exhibit 1. 24 MS. PARFITT: Let the doctor get 25 his article.</p>

18 (Pages 66 - 69)

<p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. 2 MS. PARFITT: I've asked you to 3 allow Dr. Siemiatycki to -- 4 MS. DAVIDSON: I can't hear you for 5 some reason. 6 MS. PARFITT: Oh, I'm sorry. I 7 just simply asked if he has the article. 8 He has it in front of him. 9 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I have it in 10 front of me now. 11 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 12 Q. We're looking at Table 1. 13 A. Table 1. 14 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D1, 15 Article entitled, "Association Between the 16 Frequent Use of Perineal Talcum Powder 17 Products and Ovarian Cancer: A Systematic 18 Review and Meta-analysis," by Sean A. 19 Woolen, MD, MSc, et al., was marked for 20 identification.) 21 THE WITNESS: Quality assessment 22 table, yeah. 23 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 24 Q. Are you familiar with the 25 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale?</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. Do you disagree with that? 3 A. No. I don't -- neither agree nor 4 disagree. 5 I thought you had said before that 6 they used the NHS study, so I was confused -- 7 I'm a little bit confused now about which 8 studies they used. 9 Oh, it's the NHS component of the 10 O'Brien, apparently. That's, I think, what 11 this table is indicating that was used in -- 12 whereas, I used the entire O'Brien study. 13 But it might be -- now that I think 14 about it, it might be that the other components 15 of the O'Brien study, the other cohorts did not 16 include frequency questions in their 17 questionnaire. I'm not quite sure. I'd have 18 to read the article to see why they included 19 only the NHS component. 20 Q. You don't recall sitting here 21 today? 22 A. I'm sorry? 23 Q. Sitting here today, you don't 24 recall how they made that decision, correct? 25 A. Correct.</p>
<p>1 A. I'm familiar with it. 2 Q. Have you used it before? 3 A. I'm sorry? 4 Q. Have you used it before? 5 A. No. I -- I don't believe that the 6 quality of epidemiological studies can be 7 summarized in these kind of mono-dimensional 8 scales. So I'm skeptical about the principle, 9 and I know that I can evaluate the quality of 10 studies better than by using any automated 11 tool, simplistic tool because epidemiological 12 studies are extremely complicated. And you 13 can't predict ahead of time which dimensions 14 are -- might embody fatal flaws or serious 15 flaws or flaws that are not serious, don't 16 impact the result. 17 But anyways, to answer your 18 question, I'm familiar with the scale. I've 19 never used it. I don't believe in it 20 particularly. I've never had occasion to use 21 it. 22 Q. Which study does -- do the Woolen 23 authors give the highest score to? 24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 25 THE WITNESS: To the O'Brien study.</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 Q. Would you agree or disagree with 2 Woolen's decision to rate the cohort design 3 higher than the case control designs? 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection to form. 5 THE WITNESS: I disagree if the 6 implication of the question is that they 7 did it because it was a cohort design. I 8 would have to consider carefully all of 9 the dimensions that go into determining 10 the validity and quality of a result. 11 And basically, I probably would 12 disagree with it after I did look at all 13 of that because cohort studies have a lot 14 of disadvantages as well as case control 15 studies. 16 And depending on how the Newcastle 17 Scale is weighted by people who developed 18 it 20 years ago and were not familiar with 19 these particular studies but just did it 20 in a very generic, general way, I -- my 21 appreciation -- my understanding of these 22 studies is that the Nurses Health 23 certain -- National Health Study -- so I'm 24 not sure what the National Health Study -- 25 is that the Nurses Health Study?</p>

1 Anyways, you're asking me 2 questions. I'd have to spend a couple of 3 minutes reading the paper to answer them 4 properly because I'm a bit confused now 5 about what was -- what they included. 6 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 7 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, what was my 8 question that you're currently answering? 9 A. I think your question was whether I 10 agree that the highest quality study was the 11 cohort study among these various studies that 12 they've listed. I think that was your 13 question, whether I agree with that. 14 Q. Please try to respond to the actual 15 questions being asked because you do remember 16 the question, but your response was not related 17 to the question. 18 Dr. Siemiatycki, if a woman is 19 not -- 20 A. What -- you're saying that I 21 already responded to it and then went off 22 script or something. 23 But what -- what response did you 24 get from my first comment about it? 25 I think --	Page 74 1 Q. Correct. Thank you. 2 And do you know the average age at 3 which women start using talc? 4 A. In a particular study or in 5 general? 6 Q. Have you seen any studies that 7 identify the average age when women start using 8 talc in their genital areas? 9 A. I probably have, and I don't recall 10 that particular factum; but I would guess it's 11 somewhere between the ages of 13 and 25. 12 Q. And do you know the average age at 13 which women have a tubal ligation? 14 A. I don't know that for a fact. I 15 don't know that for a fact. I could -- I could 16 guesstimate; but if you're asking me for 17 factual information, I don't know. 18 Q. Is it usually older than 15 to 25? 19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: All right. If we 22 could turn to Table 2. 23 MS. PARFITT: For the record, the 24 Woolen article. 25 THE WITNESS: Yes. Sorry. I'm not
Page 75 1 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki -- 2 A. -- I explained -- 3 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, if a woman does 4 not have patent tubes at the time that she is 5 interviewed in a -- if a woman does not have 6 patent tubes at the time she's interviewed for 7 an epidemiological study, does that mean she 8 never used talc while she had patent tubes? 9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 10 THE WITNESS: Is this in relation 11 to -- is this sequitur to the question 12 that you've just been asking? 13 I don't understand that question. 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Doctor, just answer the question. 16 MS. PARFITT: I think -- 17 THE WITNESS: I'm trying to 18 understand the question. 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. If a woman is interviewed for 21 epidemiological study and at the time she is 22 interviewed she no longer has patent tubes, 23 does she mean she never used talc at the time 24 when she had patent tubes? 25 A. No.	Page 75 Page 77 1 sure if I've lost the audio. 2 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, you went out 3 completely, just so you know. 4 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 5 Q. The authors state, "We include data 6 on women with intact fallopian tubes to 7 harmonize with other publications." 8 Do you see that at the bottom of 9 Footnote 5? Doctor? 10 A. Yeah. Sorry. I'm sorry. I'm 11 reading the entire footnote. 12 Q. I'm asking you about the last 13 sentence in the footnote. 14 Do you see it? 15 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, he's reading 16 the footnote. 17 THE WITNESS: Do you want me to 18 read only -- because my answer to the last 19 sentence only will be I need to read the 20 full footnote. 21 So should I -- should we do it in 22 two steps, or should I start reading the 23 full -- 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Doctor, please don't be difficult

<p>1 here. We're trying to get through this 2 deposition. I'm asking you a question. 3 Do you see that the authors state, 4 "We include data on women with intact fallopian 5 tubes to harmonize with other publications"? 6 Do you see that sentence? 7 MS. PARFITT: I object to your 8 characterization of this witness being 9 difficult. That is unfair, and I 10 challenge that representation, Jessica. 11 Please move forward. Just ask the 12 questions not the commentary. 13 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 14 Q. Doctor, do you see that sentence, 15 for the third time? 16 A. I see -- I see that sentence, yes. 17 Q. Doctor, can you tell me which other 18 publications on this list in Table 2 were 19 limited to women with patent tubes, if any? 20 A. I don't know. I don't know. 21 Q. When you evaluated the Woolen 22 study, did you consider whether it was accurate 23 that including data on women with intact 24 fallopian tubes would harmonize this with other 25 publications?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 Q. Right. But my question, Doctor, 2 was whether any of the other ten studies in 3 Table 2 limited -- were limited to women with 4 patent tubes. 5 A. I don't know. I'd have to look 6 through those studies. 7 Q. And then I asked: When you 8 reviewed this paper, did you look through the 9 studies to determine whether the other papers 10 were limited to women -- 11 A. No. 12 Q. -- with patent tubes? 13 A. No, no. 14 Q. That was my question. Thank you. 15 A. Okay. The answer's no. 16 Q. Doctor, if you could look at 17 Table 2, at the -- one, two, three, four, 18 five -- and the sixth column, specification of 19 talc exposure. 20 Do you see that? 21 A. Yes, I do. 22 Q. Which of these papers -- which of 23 these -- which of these relative risks used by 24 Dr. Woolen, et al., is limited -- reflects use 25 two times per week?</p>
<p>1 A. Well, I have some problem with the 2 formulation of that sentence because -- maybe 3 one of your previous questions hinted at 4 this -- but I think when people talk about 5 intact fallopian tubes and patent reproductive 6 tract and related to exposure to talc, there 7 should really be an appreciation of the 8 temporal relationship between those things. 9 So for sure women who used powder 10 and were -- and then had surgery, you have to 11 understand what the temporal sequence was 12 between these events to understand if there was 13 possible exposure to talc fibers, to talc 14 particles.</p> <p>15 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, what was my 16 question?</p> <p>17 A. Could we have the stenographer read 18 back the question?</p> <p>19 Q. You don't recall the question?</p> <p>20 A. Well, I recall the theme of the 21 question, and I recall what I was trying to 22 convey, that timing is relevant to 23 understanding whether the exposure and the 24 possibility of disease are in harmony in any 25 way.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 A. Reflects? 2 Q. Use of two times per week. 3 A. I don't know. I'd have to go 4 through them, but some of them are expressed in 5 different units; and so they are not expressed 6 in the two-times-per-week metric that you're 7 referring to. 8 Q. Do you know whether any of these 9 papers included other risk ratios for talc use 10 that more closely approximated two times per 11 week?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 13 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know how many of the papers 16 in Table 2 were not actually limited to 17 perineal talc use?</p> <p>18 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you aware that several of these 20 papers offered six or seven different risk 21 ratios for different specifications of talc 22 exposure?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 24 THE WITNESS: I would have guessed 25 that they do. Every paper usually</p>

21 (Pages 78 - 81)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 provides estimates of risk according to 2 different parameterizations of the 3 exposure variable. So I'm sure that these 4 studies, most of them, would have done 5 that.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Did you determine how Woolen chose 8 which risk ratio to use when there were 9 multiple choices in one paper?</p> <p>10 A. No, I didn't.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: All right. Let's go 12 off the record.</p> <p>13 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. All right. Let's mark as Exhibit 2 16 your Declaration of Interest that you submitted 17 to IARC.</p> <p>18 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D2, 19 Declaration of Interest for IARC/WHO 20 Experts, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. You're familiar with this 23 document?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And what's the date of it?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 about it?</p> <p>2 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>3 Q. Is it your testimony today that 4 that's accurate?</p> <p>5 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>6 Q. Is it your testimony today that 7 what you wrote here was accurate?</p> <p>8 A. At the time that I wrote it, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. So at the time that you wrote it in 10 2023, you believed that you had stopped 11 providing paid consultation services in this 12 litigation in 2020?</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I think so.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. When were you deposed last in this 17 litigation, Dr. Siemiatycki?</p> <p>18 A. In 2021. Yes. Excuse me.</p> <p>19 Q. And you provided a -- did you 20 provide a supplemental expert report in 2021?</p> <p>21 A. A supplemental?</p> <p>22 Q. Did you provide an expert report in 23 2021?</p> <p>24 A. Yes. Yes, I did. Yes, I did.</p> <p>25 Q. Were you paid for that expert</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 A. It says July 28th, 2023.</p> <p>2 Q. And that's the same day on which 3 you submitted you're -- that's the same day on 4 which you submitted your letter?</p> <p>5 A. I can't say for sure. I -- if you 6 have my letter, you -- you could show me that; 7 or I could check my e-mail.</p> <p>8 Q. Were they submitted at 9 approximately the same time?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Great. That's my question.</p> <p>12 A. Okay.</p> <p>13 Q. If we could go to your Statement of 14 Conflict, if you could read what you wrote 15 there because -- at the bottom.</p> <p>16 A. Yes. Okay.</p> <p>17 It says, "From 2016 to 2020 18 January, I provided paid consultation services 19 to a law firm -- to law firms that were 20 involved in litigation against companies that 21 produced or sold talcum powder products."</p> <p>22 Q. And, Dr. Siemiatycki, that's not 23 accurate, correct?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: What's inaccurate</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 report?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. So, in fact --</p> <p>4 A. Okay. Yeah.</p> <p>5 Q. -- your statement of declaration is 6 inaccurate, correct?</p> <p>7 A. That's correct.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. Can we go to your 9 letter?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Do you want to put 11 that in chat. I have a copy of it but --</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: We're going to mark 13 the letter as Exhibit 3.</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Okay.</p> <p>15 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D3, 16 Letter from Jack Siemiatycki to IARC re 17 Talc/Acrylonitrile Monograph 136, was 18 marked for identification.)</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, are you 20 putting it up on the screen?</p> <p>21 MR. EPSTEIN: There you go.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, again you 23 forget --</p> <p>24 MR. EPSTEIN: I shared it in chat.</p> <p>25 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you make it</p>

22 (Pages 82 - 85)

<p>1 bigger?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I have a</p> <p>3 copy of it.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. I can't</p> <p>5 hear you, Michelle.</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: I have a copy of the</p> <p>7 letter too. I'm going to put it in front</p> <p>8 of him, unless you object. It's a little</p> <p>9 bit easier to see. It's hard on the</p> <p>10 screen.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: It's the same as you</p> <p>13 have it on the screen.</p> <p>14 MS. DAVIDSON: I want it on the</p> <p>15 screen as well, Noah. I don't know why</p> <p>16 you pulled it down.</p> <p>17 MR. EPSTEIN: I'm -- I'm making the</p> <p>18 bigger.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: You can just zoom.</p> <p>20 Text Asher; ask him how to do it. He</p> <p>21 knows how. I can just zoom it on my own</p> <p>22 screen if everybody else has their --</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: He has a paper copy</p> <p>24 too. It may good for others that are</p> <p>25 participating, but I've given him a paper</p>	<p>Page 86</p> <p>1 the future."</p> <p>2 That's inaccurate as well correct?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Yes. The three-years</p> <p>5 estimate is inaccurate. The next part of</p> <p>6 the sentence is accurate. At that time I</p> <p>7 didn't anticipate future involvement.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. When did plaintiff's counsel</p> <p>10 approach you about the expert report that you</p> <p>11 submitted in the fall of 2023?</p> <p>12 A. It was a few months before --</p> <p>13 before I submitted it.</p> <p>14 Q. How many months?</p> <p>15 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>16 Q. How many months before?</p> <p>17 A. I -- I can't remember. I -- I'd</p> <p>18 have to look for evidence in emails or</p> <p>19 something like that; but off the top of my</p> <p>20 head, I don't recall. It wasn't like six</p> <p>21 months before. It was a few -- a few months</p> <p>22 before.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Did you have any</p> <p>24 communications with plaintiff's counsel in this</p> <p>25 litigation between 2020 and 2023?</p>
<p>1 copy; and I'll make sure it's provided and</p> <p>2 Xeroxed.</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. If we could go to -- it says, "In</p> <p>6 the ensuing three years, 2016 to 2019, I</p> <p>7 contributed reports to a few court cases and</p> <p>8 was deposed by the lawyers for the defense; and</p> <p>9 in one case I testified in court," right?</p> <p>10 A. Sorry. I'm not sure where</p> <p>11 you're -- where are you reading?</p> <p>12 Q. Under legal consultation related to</p> <p>13 talc --</p> <p>14 A. Oh, yes. Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q. That -- that statement, 2016 to</p> <p>16 2019, that's inaccurate as well, correct?</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And if we could continue</p> <p>21 down, down to conflict of interest.</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. It says, "I have not been involved</p> <p>24 with talc litigation in the past three years,</p> <p>25 and I do not anticipate any such involvement in</p>	<p>Page 87</p> <p>1 A. Well, there was -- as you pointed</p> <p>2 out, the 2021, there was a deposition and the</p> <p>3 report; so yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And after you submitted -- after</p> <p>5 you were deposed in 2021, have you spoken --</p> <p>6 did you speak with any plaintiff's counsel</p> <p>7 between 2021 after you were deposed and the</p> <p>8 time when you submitted your expert report in</p> <p>9 the fall of 2023?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Let's move on.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, Asher, can you</p> <p>13 put -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>14 Noah, can you put up that -- the</p> <p>15 table?</p> <p>16 MR. EPSTEIN: Which table?</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: On page -- the next</p> <p>18 page.</p> <p>19 MR. EPSTEIN: Right there at the</p> <p>20 bottom?</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: Uh-huh. It starts</p> <p>22 with Oules and Echeverria. Yes.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, is this table</p> <p>25 accurate?</p>

23 (Pages 86 - 89)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 Let me ask a different question. 2 Is this table complete and 3 accurate? 4 A. Yeah. I'm looking at the paper 5 version that Ms. Parfitt just handed me, I 6 think. 7 Q. I'm just looking at the table 8 that's on the screen. 9 I'm asking you is this table 10 complete and accurate? 11 It's a simple question. 12 A. I understand, and I'm trying to 13 rack my memory to -- 14 Q. Well, I can make it easy for you. 15 You submitted an expert report in 2021, and you 16 were deposed in 2021, correct? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. And that's not included on this 19 table, correct? 20 A. That's correct. 21 Q. So the table is not complete and 22 accurate, correct? 23 A. That's correct. 24 Q. Thank you. 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's mark as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 correct? 2 A. That's correct. 3 Q. And the final author, Anita 4 Koushik, is that the woman you said that you 5 may be doing another case control paper with? 6 A. It's another paper using the data 7 from a case control study from this same -- 8 Q. Okay. 9 A. -- case control study, yes. 10 Q. Okay. It's from this very same 11 study? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. So in other words, it's from the 14 same group of women as this? 15 A. Yes, that's correct. 16 Q. Okay. Looking at this paper, does 17 it refresh your recollection as to whether you 18 included a conflict-of-interest statement? 19 A. Yes. I see that there were no 20 competing interests declared. 21 Q. Do you recall why you failed to do 22 that? 23 A. Because I had no competing 24 interests with the -- 25 Q. Did this paper address --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 Exhibit 4 the Leung paper. 2 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D4, 3 Paper entitled, "Occupational environment 4 and ovarian cancer risk," by Lisa 5 Leung, et al., was marked for 6 identification.) 7 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah will put it in 8 the chat and put it on the screen. 9 MS. PARFITT: I'll hand you a copy 10 of that. 11 THE WITNESS: If you have a copy. 12 MS. DAVIDSON: I can't hear you, 13 Michelle, for some reason. 14 MS. PARFITT: Oh, that's all right. 15 I said I'm just handing him a completely 16 unedited, nothing on it, which we'll turn 17 over to you. It's a little bit easier. 18 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, if you -- 19 MR. EPSTEIN: I put it on the chat, 20 and here it is on the screen. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. I'm marking as Exhibit 4 24 "Occupational environment and ovarian cancer 25 risk," on which you're the third author,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 A. Sorry? 2 Q. Did this paper address talc and 3 ovarian cancer? 4 A. It doesn't address cosmetic 5 perineal talc, no. That -- that's -- that was 6 the issue on which I would have had a conflict 7 of interest. 8 Q. Did you ask the -- did you ask the 9 publishers whether it is accurate and proper to 10 not include your competing interest when the 11 paper addresses talc exposure generally rather 12 than limited to perineal talc? 13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 14 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't consult 15 anybody. 16 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 17 Q. Okay. Do you recall testifying in 18 2021 that you believed it is important for a 19 paid expert in litigation to disclose both the 20 fact that he or she has been retained as an 21 expert and which side he or she is retained on 22 behalf of? 23 A. Are you asking if I recall saying 24 that, or if I would say -- 25 Q. Well, first, do you recall that?</p>

24 (Pages 90 - 93)

<p>1 A. No, I don't recall.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you disagree with that</p> <p>3 statement?</p> <p>4 A. No, I don't disagree with it.</p> <p>5 Q. Let's go to the Davis paper, 2021.</p> <p>6 Let's mark that as Exhibit 4.</p> <p>7 A. Sorry. The Davis paper?</p> <p>8 Q. Yes.</p> <p>9 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.</p> <p>10 think that should be Exhibit 5.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, okay. Great. I</p> <p>12 can never get it right. It's a running</p> <p>13 joke that I can never keep track.</p> <p>14 All right. We're marking as</p> <p>15 Exhibit 5 a paper entitled --</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Michelle, are you</p> <p>17 looking for that or should I --</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Yeah. Give us one</p> <p>19 second.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. -- "Genital powder use and risk of</p> <p>22 epithelial ovarian cancer --</p> <p>23 A. Wait. Hold on. Wait. We're</p> <p>24 looking for the article.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. That's fine. I'm marking it</p>	<p>Page 94</p> <p>1 paper --</p> <p>2 MR. TISI: What's confusing --</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: -- great. Let's go</p> <p>4 off the record.</p> <p>5 MR. TISI: Excuse me.</p> <p>6 MS. DAVIDSON: Chris, we have one</p> <p>7 person --</p> <p>8 MR. TISI: Excuse me.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: No. We have one</p> <p>10 person defending this deposition.</p> <p>11 MR. TISI: I understand, but it's</p> <p>12 confusing. It's about 6 inches.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. TISI: 6 inches. I got to get</p> <p>15 him the copy of the paper.</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: Is it you or</p> <p>17 Michelle defending this deposition?</p> <p>18 MR. TISI: Okay. Michelle, will</p> <p>19 you tell her how big the screen is.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go off the</p> <p>21 record while you look for the paper.</p> <p>22 MR. TISI: Fine. Thank you.</p> <p>23 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. I'd like to read the conflict of</p>
<p>1 as an exhibit.</p> <p>2 A. Okay. Thank you. Sorry.</p> <p>3 Q. We're marking as Exhibit 5,</p> <p>4 "Genital powder use and risk of epithelial</p> <p>5 ovarian cancer in the ovarian cancer in women</p> <p>6 of African ancestry consortium." First author</p> <p>7 Davis, published in 2021.</p> <p>8 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D5,</p> <p>9 Paper entitled, "Genital powder use and</p> <p>10 risk of epithelial ovarian cancer in the</p> <p>11 Ovarian Cancer in Women of African</p> <p>12 Ancestry Consortium," by Colette P.</p> <p>13 Davis, et al., was marked for</p> <p>14 identification.)</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Can you please turn to the bottom</p> <p>17 of page 1?</p> <p>18 MR. TISI: You've got -- you've got</p> <p>19 to wait until we get the paper. Okay?</p> <p>20 It's okay for you to identify it.</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. We sent</p> <p>22 it to you in the chat.</p> <p>23 MR. TISI: I understand, but --</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: Fine. If you're</p> <p>25 going to take the time to find the</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 disclosure statement. It says --</p> <p>2 A. Sorry?</p> <p>3 Q. It says, "Patricia Moorman has</p> <p>4 received compensation for work related to</p> <p>5 litigation in regard to talc and ovarian</p> <p>6 cancer. All other authors report no conflict</p> <p>7 of interest."</p> <p>8 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Does -- does Ms. -- Dr. Moorman</p> <p>11 disclose here which side she testified on</p> <p>12 behalf of?</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I don't see that</p> <p>15 indicated, no.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. And do you recall that you</p> <p>18 testified in 2021 that a proper</p> <p>19 conflict-of-interest disclosure would say which</p> <p>20 side you're appearing on behalf of, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>23 If we could turn to Table 3.</p> <p>24 A. Of what? Of the Davis paper?</p> <p>25 Q. Yeah. We're still on the Davis</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

1 paper. 2 A. Okay. 3 Q. Table 3 for African American women, 4 the OR is lower than for all participants and 5 for white participants and also is not 6 statistically significant, correct? 7 A. I'm still looking for that page. 8 Sorry. 9 Table 3 you said? 10 Q. Yeah. It's up on the screen. 11 A. Yeah. I'm sorry. The screen font 12 is too small for me to read. 13 But I have the paper in front of 14 me. 15 Can you repeat your question? 16 Q. The OR for African American women 17 is lower than the OR for white women, correct? 18 A. Sorry. I don't see -- where -- 19 where are the results for African American 20 women? 21 Oh, yes, yes. Okay. I'm 22 reorienting myself to this particular layout. 23 And which particular -- can you 24 point to particular cells in this table that 25 you are looking at?	Page 98	Page 100 1 women is statistically significant, correct? 2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 3 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 4 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 5 Q. Thank you. 6 A. The term "statistically 7 significant" has to be qualified. 8 You mean at the .05 level, I 9 assume. 10 Q. Thank you. 11 A. Is that correct? 12 To clarify your question. Because 13 statistical significance -- 14 MS. PARFITT: He's still talking. 15 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 16 Q. I understand your testimony. 17 A. -- depends on the level of alpha 18 error that you assume in the test. 19 Q. The Davis paper did not find a 20 dose-response relationship, right? 21 A. I -- I don't know. 22 In which -- which table would I 23 find those results? 24 Q. You don't recall from reviewing 25 this paper?
1 Q. I'm just asking you, 2 Dr. Siemiatycki, is the OR for African American 3 women lower than the OR for white women? 4 A. The results here for all cases, 5 high-grade -- 6 Q. All cases. Let's look at all 7 cases. 8 A. Okay. Thank you for that. So -- 9 so the 1.22 for African American women and 10 versus the 1.32 for all participants, is that 11 what you're comparing or asking me? 12 Q. Doctor, I asked about white women, 13 correct? 14 A. No. I -- I didn't remember every 15 word that you used in your preamble. 16 So yes. Thank you. 17 Q. It wasn't a preamble. It was a 18 question. 19 And my question was: Is the OR for 20 African American women under all cases lower 21 than for white women? 22 A. The point estimate is lower, yes. 23 Q. And also, the point estimate for 24 African American women is not statistically 25 significant, while the point estimate for white	Page 99	Page 101 1 When's the last time you looked at 2 this paper, Doctor? 3 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I might add 4 that I will give you a little leeway; but 5 back in your '21 deposition -- and I can 6 give you the pages -- Dr. Siemiatycki was 7 examined with regard to the Davis paper on 8 page -- 9 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, I'm not 10 going to go through this with every 11 question. It was added to his 2021 report 12 -- to his 2023. It wasn't in that report. 13 I'm more than able to ask him about it. 14 If you want to take that to the judge, go 15 ahead because we'll win. 16 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 17 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki -- 18 MS. PARFITT: Well, Jessica, that's 19 quite conclusionary. But my point being 20 this: You examined on page 143 of his 21 2021 deposition the Davis article. Let 22 this record reflect that. I'll give you a 23 little leeway, Jessica. 24 MS. DAVIDSON: You're not giving me 25 leeway, Michelle. That's bullshit. I

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 mean, come on.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Oh, my goodness,</p> <p>3 Jessica. You should watch your language.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, it's just</p> <p>5 like this entire deposition, every</p> <p>6 question I ask, either you're</p> <p>7 filibustering it or Dr. Siemiatycki's</p> <p>8 answering a question I haven't asked.</p> <p>9 It's getting very, very frustrating. It's</p> <p>10 getting very frustrating.</p> <p>11 You know very well that he added a</p> <p>12 section to his report about Davis. I'm</p> <p>13 sorry for my foul language. I'm just</p> <p>14 incredibly, incredibly frustrated because</p> <p>15 I'm asking you guys to just let me ask my</p> <p>16 questions. Let the doctor answer them.</p> <p>17 You know there's this in the</p> <p>18 report. You're not giving me leeway.</p> <p>19 It's the -- there's no need for leeway</p> <p>20 because it's added to his report. Like,</p> <p>21 to suggest that you're giving me leeway,</p> <p>22 is disingenuous.</p> <p>23 And, again, I apologize for losing</p> <p>24 my temper. I apologize for my foul mouth,</p> <p>25 but you're not giving me any leeway.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 with Ms. Parfitt?</p> <p>2 A. No. I had 200 papers in my</p> <p>3 binders, and I didn't look at all of them in</p> <p>4 the last three days. And I looked at the ones</p> <p>5 that I considered the most important ones, not</p> <p>6 necessarily the ones -- well, so I would have</p> <p>7 to look at the paper to answer your questions</p> <p>8 about it. I can't, by memory, recall</p> <p>9 everything that's in the paper.</p> <p>10 Q. So you do not recall whether the</p> <p>11 Davis paper found a dose response?</p> <p>12 A. Not without looking at it.</p> <p>13 Q. If I were to tell you that the</p> <p>14 Davis paper stated, "Furthermore, there was not</p> <p>15 a dose-response relationship between frequency</p> <p>16 or duration of genital powder use and ovarian</p> <p>17 cancer risk or any significant differences in</p> <p>18 association by histotype," that does not</p> <p>19 refresh your recollection?</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Can you point us to a</p> <p>21 page, Jessica?</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry, Michelle?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Maybe -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>24 If you could just point him to a page.</p> <p>25 MS. DAVIDSON: Asher -- I keep</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 This was added to his report; and</p> <p>2 obviously it's fair game for questioning,</p> <p>3 Michelle.</p> <p>4 And you and I generally get along,</p> <p>5 so let's just get along today.</p> <p>6 Again, I'm sorry I lost my temper.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Let's --</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, when is the last</p> <p>12 time you looked at the Davis paper?</p> <p>13 A. I can't recall. I certainly</p> <p>14 haven't done a sort of an in-depth forensic</p> <p>15 evaluation of it in at least a month or so or</p> <p>16 maybe longer, but I -- I probably skimmed it</p> <p>17 recently; but not -- it's not -- it's not fresh</p> <p>18 in my memory.</p> <p>19 Q. You didn't look at it when you were</p> <p>20 preparing for your deposition with Ms. --</p> <p>21 A. When I --</p> <p>22 Q. -- with Ms. Parfitt?</p> <p>23 A. When I looked at what?</p> <p>24 Q. Did you look at the Davis paper</p> <p>25 when you were preparing for your deposition</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 calling Noah Asher. Asher is on vacation.</p> <p>2 Noah, can you please put up this</p> <p>3 language?</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Thank you, Jessica.</p> <p>5 We appreciate it.</p> <p>6 MS. DAVIDSON: Of course.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Am I waiting for you</p> <p>8 to point out a page?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: He just put it on the</p> <p>10 screen.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. "We observed" -- it's in the bottom</p> <p>13 paragraph there: "We observed no clear</p> <p>14 dose-response trends for frequency or duration</p> <p>15 of genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk</p> <p>16 among AA women or white women."</p> <p>17 Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: It's on page 8</p> <p>20 doctor.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Did you address that in your</p> <p>24 report?</p> <p>25 A. What do you mean by did I "address</p>

27 (Pages 102 - 105)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 that"?</p> <p>2 Q. Did you address in your report the 3 fact that Davis did not find a dose-response 4 relationship?</p> <p>5 A. No, I didn't.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. It didn't change anything in my -- 8 it wouldn't have changed anything in my report.</p> <p>9 Q. So if we could mark your report as 10 Exhibit 6.</p> <p>11 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D6, 12 Second Amended Expert Report of Jack 13 Siemiatycki, MSc, PhD, was marked for 14 identification.)</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. In the back of your report, Doctor, 17 you have some tables, right?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And some of those tables address 20 dose response, right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: He is still looking 23 at the Davis paper. You've now directed 24 him to the expert report.</p> <p>25 Jessica, I'll make comment too. I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 tables is that it overlaps with other papers?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Let's move on.</p> <p>4 Let's look at Phung 2022.</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, we're just 6 grabbing his paper.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: No problem. No 8 problem. Phung 2022 is Exhibit 7.</p> <p>9 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D7, 10 Paper entitled, "Effects of risk factors 11 for ovarian cancer in women with and 12 without endometriosis," by Minh Tung 13 Phung, MPH, PhD, et al., was marked for 14 identification.)</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's -- let's mark 16 it as, "Effects of risk factors for 17 ovarian cancer in women with and without 18 endometriosis." The first author is Phung 19 2022.</p> <p>20 MR. TISI: Wait a second.</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: And I want to go 22 down to page -- I want to -- okay. Sure. 23 I just want to go to page 960.</p> <p>24 MR. TISI: We're not listening to 25 you right now because he's finding the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 know this is really hard. He's a little 2 hard of hearing.</p> <p>3 So just -- just -- I'm being 4 delicate, Doctor. I'll make that point. 5 She's just told you she's gone to your 6 expert report.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Thank you, Jessica.</p> <p>9 I appreciate it.</p> <p>10 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, nobody has 11 ever complained that my voice is too soft. 12 It's usually the opposite.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. Doctor, did you add the Davis paper 15 to the tables in the back of your report?</p> <p>16 A. No, I didn't. In fact, it's coming 17 back to me. My recollection is that the data 18 in the Davis paper, in fact, overlaps with the 19 data in some of the other stud- -- some of the 20 other articles that have been written.</p> <p>21 And if you give me some time, I'll 22 try to figure out which papers it overlaps 23 with.</p> <p>24 Q. So, Doctor, your testimony is that 25 the reason you didn't include Davis in your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 paper.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Understood.</p> <p>3 Understood.</p> <p>4 MR. TISI: Give us a moment, and 5 we'll see if we can find it.</p> <p>6 MS. DAVIDSON: I want to go to the 7 authors' conflict statement.</p> <p>8 For some reason, Noah, I have 9 different page numbers because sometimes 10 one is the one pulled off the web, and one 11 is the one that's not; and I think that's 12 creating some confusion with you. But 13 yes, this is --</p> <p>14 MR. EPSTEIN: Yeah. I'm seeing 15 that.</p> <p>16 Am I in the right spot.</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: That was the problem 18 with the Davis paper as well.</p> <p>19 MR. EPSTEIN: Sorry about that.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: I have different 21 versions. I'm sorry about that, but now 22 you're moving --</p> <p>23 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay. Did I -- did 24 I --</p> <p>25 MS. DAVIDSON: You've just gone to</p>

1 the wrong page. I want to go to the 2 disclosures. 3 It's weird. What you have up here 4 has some Spanish in it. Okay. So here we 5 go. Yeah. Down there. 6 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay. 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. If we look at the disclosures 9 acknowledgements, Doctor. 10 A. I'm sorry. Look at what? 11 Q. We're looking at the, I believe 12 it's the very last page, acknowledgements. 13 It says -- and I'll read to you, 14 except it's -- you have issues with your ears. 15 I have issues with my eyes. We're a great 16 pair -- we're a great pair here today. But it 17 says -- 18 A. Hear no evil. See no evil. 19 Q. It says, "D.W.C. reports payments 20 from expert -- for expert testimony from 21 Ferraro Law Firm and Ashcarft and Gerel Law 22 Firm." 23 Do you see that? 24 A. In the last -- in the paragraph 25 labeled "Acknowledgements"?	Page 110 1 Ashcraft and Gerel is or the Ferraro Law Firm? 2 A. I doubt it but -- 3 Q. Okay. So -- so the average person 4 would not -- who reads this -- who reads 5 medical journals would not know whether 6 Dr. Cramer was a witness for the plaintiffs or 7 for the defense, correct? 8 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 9 THE WITNESS: Correct. Correct. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Okay. Let's move on. 12 If we could look at Table 2. 13 A. Of which paper now? 14 Q. We're on the same paper. 15 A. Okay. 16 Q. Table 2. 17 MS. DAVIDSON: You've got to turn 18 it right side up, Noah. 19 MR. EPSTEIN: Yeah. Let me figure 20 out how to do that. Sorry about that. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah has been a 22 lawyer for three months, so let's all give 23 him a kudos for doing a great job. 24 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, we're fine 25 with that.
Page 111 1 Q. Yes. So the third paragraph, 2 "Acknowledgements" on line 6. 3 A. I must not be looking in the right 4 place. 5 Q. If you look up on the -- on the 6 camera -- on the screen, I will read it to you. 7 A. Okay. Can you blow up that about 8 threefold? 9 Q. Fourfold. "D.W.C. reports" -- 10 A. Are we talking about the Phung 11 paper? 12 Q. I'm reading you the sentence. It's 13 really half a sentence. 14 It says, "D.W.C. reports payment 15 from expert testimony from Ferraro Law Firm and 16 Ashcarft and Gerel Law Firm." 17 Do you see that? 18 A. Okay. 19 MS. PARFITT: Let the record 20 reflect I have directed the doctor to it. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Michelle. 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. 23 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 24 Q. Okay. Would the average person 25 reading scientific papers know what the	Page 113 1 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, it's your 2 first deposition? 3 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: Your last? 5 MR. EPSTEIN: So Table 2. I'm -- I 6 can't get it to -- 7 MS. PARFITT: Hey, Noah, we have 8 it. 9 MR. LYONS: I have the paper. 10 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. 11 MR. LYONS: I'm also happy to pull 12 it up if you want. I have the version, I 13 believe, that Dr. Siemiatycki has, which 14 is the final published version, rather 15 than the author manuscript. 16 MS. DAVIDSON: We have it as well, 17 Noah. I'm not sure why you have the 18 author manuscript there. 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. Okay. So, Dr. Siemiatycki, what is 21 the reported OR for first-degree family history 22 of ovarian cancer with endometriosis? 23 A. With endometriosis? So we're 24 looking sort of at the bottom right-hand area 25 of that table, and there is an OR of 1.58.

29 (Pages 110 - 113)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 Is that the one you're looking at?</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And what is the OR for</p> <p>3 first-degree family history of ovarian cancer</p> <p>4 without endometriosis?</p> <p>5 A. It looks like it's 2.20.</p> <p>6 Q. Why would having endometriosis</p> <p>7 cause the risk factor of first-degree family</p> <p>8 history, to go down?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know</p> <p>11 that it does.</p> <p>12 Among other things, when I -- when</p> <p>13 I look at relative risk estimates, I also</p> <p>14 look at the confidence intervals around</p> <p>15 them to see what the data really means.</p> <p>16 And if you notice, the upper</p> <p>17 confidence limit of both of those point</p> <p>18 estimates that you highlighted are</p> <p>19 identical -- that's a coincidence -- at</p> <p>20 2.57; but the important part of the</p> <p>21 message is that they don't differ very</p> <p>22 much. Statistically, they overlap</p> <p>23 greatly.</p> <p>24 And so the two point estimates of</p> <p>25 1.58 that you pointed at and 2.20 that you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 different as the point estimates would</p> <p>2 indicate.</p> <p>3 Q. So do these -- do these two</p> <p>4 confidence intervals overlap considerably?</p> <p>5 A. They do overlap considerably.</p> <p>6 Q. And how do you define "overlap</p> <p>7 considerably"?</p> <p>8 You knew I was going to ask that.</p> <p>9 A. Yeah. So I mean, if you imagine in</p> <p>10 your mind sort of a little graphic display with</p> <p>11 one of them showing the odds ratio for women</p> <p>12 with endometriosis and one without, the middle</p> <p>13 of the two confidence intervals would be</p> <p>14 different.</p> <p>15 One goes from 1.88 to 2.57, so it</p> <p>16 is -- it covers that part of the graph. And</p> <p>17 the other one covers the part of the graph from</p> <p>18 .97 to 2.57. And, you know, just by eyeballing</p> <p>19 it, you can see that they overlap. Those two</p> <p>20 ranges overlap considerably.</p> <p>21 Now, it's possible to do</p> <p>22 statistical tests to show to what -- whether</p> <p>23 the amount of overlap is so -- the difference</p> <p>24 is so great that despite the variability,</p> <p>25 there's still significant differences between</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 pointed at, although they look different,</p> <p>2 would not be -- they're not so different</p> <p>3 that they require theorizing about.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So let me make sure I</p> <p>6 understand.</p> <p>7 Are you saying that if two</p> <p>8 confidence intervals overlap, they're not so</p> <p>9 different that they suggest an actual effect</p> <p>10 difference?</p> <p>11 And forgive me if my language</p> <p>12 isn't --</p> <p>13 A. Yeah. No. I -- I -- I forgive you</p> <p>14 if you forgive me my verbal errors.</p> <p>15 I'm saying that if you look at two</p> <p>16 confidence intervals for the same parameter and</p> <p>17 you're trying to compare them, if they overlap</p> <p>18 considerably -- and I'm not going to define</p> <p>19 what I mean by "considerably" -- but if they</p> <p>20 overlap considerably, then the plausible range</p> <p>21 of true underlying relative risks for the two</p> <p>22 entities that you're comparing, the women with</p> <p>23 first-degree history and the women -- sorry,</p> <p>24 the women with endometriosis and the women</p> <p>25 without endometriosis, that they are not as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 them.</p> <p>2 But in this case I can assure you</p> <p>3 that if you did such a test, it would show that</p> <p>4 there is no statistically significant</p> <p>5 difference between those two estimates.</p> <p>6 Q. How is that test done?</p> <p>7 A. So I -- I think it started when you</p> <p>8 asked me to speculate on possible reasons for</p> <p>9 the differences. And my answer would be that I</p> <p>10 wouldn't even go to the point of trying to find</p> <p>11 an explanation, which might not be -- for</p> <p>12 something that might not be their, namely a</p> <p>13 difference between endometri- -- with</p> <p>14 endometriosis and without endometriosis.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. My question was: Like,</p> <p>16 when you use the term "overlap considerably,"</p> <p>17 is that just sort of subjective of what you</p> <p>18 see; or is there an actual mathematical test?</p> <p>19 A. The actual mathematical test would</p> <p>20 be a test of the difference between the point</p> <p>21 estimates of 2.20 and 1.58, the difference</p> <p>22 between those two, considering the variability</p> <p>23 of those two estimates or the imprecision.</p> <p>24 Those two are imprecise estimates. The</p> <p>25 imprecision is captured by the 95-percent</p>

30 (Pages 114 - 117)

Page 118 1 confidence interval. 2 And if you do the mathematics to 3 plug in the point estimates and the confidence 4 intervals, that's how you would test the 5 difference between the two. 6 And no, in the past 30 seconds, I 7 have not done such a test; but by experience, I 8 can tell you that it's not even close to 9 statistically significant. 10 Q. Got it. So you're saying the 11 difference -- just to make sure I understand, 12 you're saying the difference in the confidence 13 intervals is not statistically significant? 14 A. No. I'm saying the difference in 15 the point estimates is -- given the confidence 16 intervals. 17 Q. Okay. 18 A. The difference in the point 19 estimates, I'm saying, is not statistically 20 significantly different. 21 Q. So the difference between 1.58 and 22 2.20 is not statistically significant because 23 there is considerable overlap in the confidence 24 intervals -- 25 A. Yes.	Page 120 1 confidence interval or not. It is pretty wide. 2 But I'm saying that the two 3 confidence intervals overlap considerably. 4 Q. Okay. 5 A. And that means that a whole range 6 of -- what -- what you're really interested in 7 when you're making these kind of estimates is 8 what is the true underlying relative risk, not 9 what is the relative risk in this sample of 10 women in such and such a city that I happen to 11 interview in such a year or so on. 12 You're trying to make a generic, 13 generalizable estimate of something. And the 14 something is what is the relative risk among 15 women with endometriosis. 16 Now, you have a small sample of 17 people in -- in these studies, small enough 18 that the -- each -- well, no matter what the 19 size is, each statistical estimate of point 20 estimate embodies a certain degree of 21 precision. And that degree of precision can be 22 expressed in various forms. 23 And one way of expressing it is in 24 the width of the confidence interval. And the 25 confidence interval can be -- you can think of
Page 119 1 Q. -- is that a fair way to put it? 2 A. That's a fair way to put it. I 3 mean, the overlap in the confidence intervals 4 is just another way of expressing that there's 5 a lot of statistical imprecision in the two 6 point estimates. 7 Q. I'm sorry. Can you explain that 8 again? 9 A. Yes. Sorry. So the -- you know, 10 what -- I use the overlap in the confidence 11 intervals as a shorthand for me because I 12 understand the implications that -- to indicate 13 that the two point estimates are very unstable. 14 They depend on small numbers and they could 15 fluctuate. 16 And, you know, I don't know if you 17 want to go to examples about flipping coins; 18 and, you know, I could sort of conjure 19 up some -- 20 Q. Sorry, Doctor. 21 Is 1.88 to 2.57, that's a wide 22 confidence interval? 23 A. 1.88 to 2.57? 24 Q. Uh-huh. 25 A. I'm not saying it's a wide	Page 121 1 it as indicating the range of true underlying 2 relative risks that can be -- that could 3 hypothetically be found in the total population 4 if you had, you know, the total population of 5 the United States or an infinite population, 6 even, of women who you've interviewed and you 7 know really, you know, what is the 8 endometriosis status and so on. 9 But the -- you don't have that. 10 You have an estimate from a sample. And the 11 estimate of 2.20 is your best estimate from 12 this sample of the true underlying relative 13 risk. 14 The confidence interval tells you 15 how good your sample estimate is, how precise 16 it is in capturing the true underlying relative 17 risk. And it's kind of telling you that with 18 95-percent probability, the true underlying 19 relative risk among the women without 20 endometriosis -- I'm just taking that as the 21 example -- that the true underlying risk, 22 there's a 95-percent probability that it's 23 somewhere in the range from 1.88 to 2.57. 24 So you could have think of the 25 confidence interval as an expression of that

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 kind of statement. It's -- it's -- what I've 2 just said it's not strictly a hundred percent 3 accurate. It's a more complicated, slightly 4 more complicated statistical issue, but need no 5 need to get in to it.</p> <p>6 At a first approximation, you can 7 think of the confidence interval as telling you 8 how close your sample -- what is the range of 9 possible underlying true relative risks that 10 are compatible with the data that you've 11 collected.</p> <p>12 And this is saying that for the 13 without endometriosis women, the true relative 14 risk ranges from -- with 95-percent probability 15 from 1.88 to 2.57; whereas, for with 16 endometriosis, it ran -- the true value ranges 17 from .97 to -- to 2.57. And those two ranges 18 are -- you know, it's just common sense. They 19 overlap a lot. A lot of those two ranges, you 20 know, one -- one is largely subsumed in the 21 other.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. I think I've got it. Thank 23 you.</p> <p>24 A. Thank you.</p> <p>25 Q. Let's mark as Exhibit 8 the Gabriel</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Let the record 2 reflect, I've just handed the doctor a 3 blank copy of the Gabriel paper.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Doctor, this paper was published in 7 2019. If I read your reports right and the 8 redline, you did not include it in your 2021 9 report; but you included it in your 2023 10 report. Is that correct?</p> <p>11 A. I'll take your word for that. I 12 can't remember.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know why you didn't include 14 it originally and included it now?</p> <p>15 A. Well, I -- I guess I included it 16 now because I came upon it at some point. And 17 I didn't include it in 2021. I don't know. It 18 might have been an oversight. I -- I can't 19 think that there would have been a -- I'm not 20 sure -- I'm not sure why. I don't see --</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Can we go to the Disclosure 22 of Potential Conflicts of Interest.</p> <p>23 A. That's at the back of the article, 24 I think. Oh, yes. I see that.</p> <p>25 Q. It says here, "A.F. Vitonis has</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 2019 paper.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, just 3 give us a moment to get that paper. I 4 appreciate it.</p> <p>5 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D8, 6 Paper entitled, "Douching, Talc Use, and 7 Risk for Ovarian Cancer and Conditions 8 Related to Genital Tract Inflammation," by 9 Iwona M. Gabriel, et al., was marked for 10 identification.)</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: This paper.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Again, one moment. I 13 don't want to take your time.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. This paper is entitled, "Douching, 16 Talc Use, and Risk for Ovarian Cancer and 17 Conditions Related to Genital Tract 18 Inflammation." The authors are Iwona Gabriel, 19 Allison Vitonis, William Welch, Linda Titus, 20 and Daniel Cramer.</p> <p>21 Do you see that?</p> <p>22 A. Yeah. I'm --</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: One second, Jessica.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: We're just looking 25 for it. Sorry.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 provided statistical programming to support 2 expert testimony for Beasley Allen Law Firm. 3 D.W. Cramer has provided expert testimony for 4 Beasley Allen Law Firm."</p> <p>5 Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>7 Q. And you'll agree with me that the 8 average person who is reading a journal 9 entitled "Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & 10 Prevention" would not know what the Beasley 11 Allen Law Firm is, correct?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. So the average person reading this 16 paper would not be able to determine which side 17 Dr. Cramer and Mr. -- or Dr. Vitonis was 18 providing testimony for, right?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Have you ever spoken to 23 either Dr. O'Brien or Dr. Wentzensen?</p> <p>24 A. Not that I'm aware of. Not that I 25 recall.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 Q. Are you familiar -- are you 2 familiar with their reputations? 3 A. I'm familiar with their 4 publications in the -- in the talc domain that 5 are part of the references in my report. 6 Q. Do you know where they work? 7 A. I think they work in North 8 Carolina, if I'm not mistaken, at Research 9 Triangle Park for -- maybe for NIEHS; but I'm 10 not positive. I'm just recollecting or 11 guessing. I'm not sure. 12 Q. And they -- they are not expert 13 witnesses for either side on this litigation, 14 correct? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: I -- there's no way I 17 would know that. I have no idea. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Well, have they disclosed any 20 conflicts of interest? 21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 22 THE WITNESS: Where? 23 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 24 Q. In their papers. 25 Do you recall seeing any conflicts</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 author. I think that's the right term, the 2 first author and the corresponding author. 3 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit D9, 4 Paper entitled, "A critical review of talc 5 and ovarian cancer," by Julie 6 Goodman, et al., was marked for 7 identification.) 8 THE WITNESS: It's Julie? 9 MS. PARFITT: Julie. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, your camera is not 12 on -- 13 A. Sorry. 14 Q. -- which is a problem for a 15 deposition -- 16 A. Which one is it -- 17 Q. Let's first get Dr. Siemiatycki's 18 camera on. 19 Do we need to go off the record for 20 that? 21 A. No. 22 Q. There we go. 23 A. Sorry about that. 24 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you have the 25 Goodman 2020 paper?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 of interest were disclosed in their papers? 2 A. I haven't memorized all the 3 conflict-of-interest paragraphs in every paper 4 I've looked at. So I don't -- 5 Q. Do you know whether employees of 6 the National Institutes of Health are even 7 allowed to serve as experts in private 8 litigation? 9 MS. PARFITT: No. I have no idea. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. You wouldn't be surprised to learn 12 that ex -- that -- that scientists who work for 13 the federal government are not allowed to serve 14 as experts in litigation, would you? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: No, I wouldn't be 17 surprised to learn that. 18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Let's go off 19 the record. 20 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. We're going to mark as Exhibit 9 a 23 paper entitled, "A critical review of talc and 24 ovarian cancer," by Julie Goodman, et al. 25 And Julie is the corresponding</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 A. Not quite, but now I believe I do. 2 Yes. Thank you. 3 Q. Okay. And you address this paper 4 in your new report, correct? 5 A. That's correct. 6 Q. And you did not address it in your 7 2021 report, correct? 8 A. That's correct. 9 Q. Did -- were you aware of this paper 10 when you wrote your 2021 report? 11 A. I may have been aware of it and not 12 considered that it would influence my opinion 13 one way or the other, but I probably adopted a 14 more generous attitude to being inclusive of 15 articles this time than I did before. 16 Q. Did you do any research as to 17 Dr. Goodman's credentials? 18 A. I don't recall having done that. 19 Q. You mentioned in your paper -- in 20 your report that this paper was carried out by 21 a private research firm. 22 Do you recall saying that? 23 A. I now have my report in front of me 24 as well. And yes, I recall saying that -- 25 well, writing it, yes.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Q. Were you suggesting anything with 2 that language?</p> <p>3 A. Yeah. I can't say that I'm 4 completely naive about the use of that 5 language; so I guess it -- in my mind, reading 6 the article, it felt like it would have been a 7 solicited paper to defend a point of view.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you feel that way about 9 Dr. Egilman's letter to the editor responding 10 to other papers?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: You know, I didn't 13 feel exactly the same way about it.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. And why is that?</p> <p>16 A. Sorry?</p> <p>17 Q. Why is that?</p> <p>18 A. Well, because for one thing, he was 19 on a completely -- he took a completely 20 different editorial opinion to the issues at 21 hand; but I -- I don't know -- I don't know for 22 a fact -- I suspect that Egilman was more of a 23 self-initiated intervenor in this matter.</p> <p>24 Whereas, a private contract firm would more 25 likely be responding to a request.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 kinds of issues, including female cancer risks 2 from various hormonal factors. But -- so I'm 3 not sure if it's the same person. I didn't 4 look her up specifically when I saw the name on 5 this article.</p> <p>6 Q. So your opinions about the validity 7 of this article are -- are not based on any 8 actual knowledge of Dr. Goodman's background, 9 correct?</p> <p>10 A. I guess not.</p> <p>11 Q. Is Johns Hopkins --</p> <p>12 A. I don't know which Dr. Goodman it 13 was. I didn't look -- as I said, I didn't look 14 her up to see if it was the one that I recall 15 from previous experience.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know if Johns Hopkins has a 17 strong epidemiology program?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. Quite --</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Quite strong.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. And do you know whether Dr. Goodman 23 is a fellow of the American College of 24 Epidemiology?</p> <p>25 A. If it's the one -- if it's the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have any objective basis for 2 that assumption?</p> <p>3 A. Which part of it?</p> <p>4 Q. The part about Dr. Egilman and the 5 part about this paper?</p> <p>6 A. I know Egilman a little bit, and I 7 know that he is a very energetic, active 8 proponent of his scientific beliefs and 9 theories; and he doesn't really -- in my 10 experience, he doesn't need a solicitation from 11 a law firm or a company or an intervenor to -- 12 to put forth his opinions.</p> <p>13 So that would be, you know, the 14 basis for my prejudiced or, you know, 15 subjective view about the motivations. In that 16 I'm not implying the validity or the quality of 17 either of the points of view.</p> <p>18 Q. Does Dr. Egilman have a degree in 19 epidemiology?</p> <p>20 A. I'm not sure. I don't know.</p> <p>21 Q. Does Dr. Goodman have a degree in 22 epidemiology?</p> <p>23 A. I think -- you know, I'm not sure 24 if it's the one that I remember from sort of a 25 career at Harvard doing epidemiology on various</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 person I'm thinking of, then I would be 2 surprised if she doesn't have that.</p> <p>3 Q. Is Dr. Egilman a fellow of the 4 American College of Epidemiology?</p> <p>5 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>6 Q. Has Dr. Egilman ever taught 7 epidemiology?</p> <p>8 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>9 Q. Has Dr. Egilman ever been a cancer 10 prevention fellow at NCI?</p> <p>11 A. I -- I'm not aware of it.</p> <p>12 Q. Does Dr. Egilman have any 13 professional experience in gynecological 14 cancers prior to being a witness in this 15 litigation?</p> <p>16 A. I'm unaware.</p> <p>17 Q. Are you aware that Dr. Goodman was 18 a cancer prevention fellow at NCI?</p> <p>19 A. If it's the person that I'm 20 thinking of, then it wouldn't surprise me if 21 she had all of those pieces on her CV, yeah.</p> <p>22 Q. NCI is the National Cancer 23 Institute, right?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Are you familiar with that</p>

<p>1 organization?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I have some familiarity with</p> <p>3 it.</p> <p>4 Q. Is it a respected organization?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>6 answered.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Well, it's an</p> <p>8 enormous beast. It's like asking if the</p> <p>9 United States has any respect.</p> <p>10 Yes, NCI is a respected</p> <p>11 organization; and its main job is to do</p> <p>12 research and to fund research.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. We can take</p> <p>14 this paper down.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, are you aware that</p> <p>17 ovarian cancer rates have fallen significantly</p> <p>18 over the last 20 to 30 years?</p> <p>19 A. I'm aware that they've declined.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you --</p> <p>21 A. But I don't know about</p> <p>22 significantly. I don't know what you mean by</p> <p>23 that, but they've -- yes.</p> <p>24 Q. How much did they decline?</p> <p>25 A. Sorry?</p>	<p>Page 134</p> <p>1 for public health that the incidence of ovarian</p> <p>2 cancer fell precipitously over 30 years, right?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. If it's completely true, then</p> <p>4 I think it's great.</p> <p>5 Q. During the 30 years when ovarian</p> <p>6 cancer rates declined precipitously, did that</p> <p>7 follow a precipitous decline in talcum powder</p> <p>8 use?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I don't know. You</p> <p>11 know, I guess -- I don't know if anyone</p> <p>12 has done an analysis of time trends in</p> <p>13 talcum powder use and in talcum powder</p> <p>14 composition, and that's what would be</p> <p>15 required.</p> <p>16 I believe -- I hope I'm not making</p> <p>17 this up, but I believe there has been some</p> <p>18 decline in use of talcum powder by women.</p> <p>19 And there have certainly been changes in</p> <p>20 composition of talcum powder since the</p> <p>21 1980s. There's been less mineral and more</p> <p>22 of other products that have the same</p> <p>23 effect.</p> <p>24 So there's a possibility that some</p> <p>25 of that has played in to changing</p>
<p>1 Q. Do you know how much they declined?</p> <p>2 A. I don't.</p> <p>3 Q. Are you aware that the incidence</p> <p>4 rate for new cases of ovarian cancer fell from</p> <p>5 14.9 per 100,000 people to 9.6 between 1992 and</p> <p>6 2019?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>8 answered.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of</p> <p>10 those numbers.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Do you have an opinion as to why</p> <p>13 those numbers have fallen?</p> <p>14 A. Whenever there are changes in</p> <p>15 incidence of a disease, one of the first</p> <p>16 questions that should be asked is whether there</p> <p>17 have been any changes in diagnostic habits of</p> <p>18 physicians or pathologists in regard to the</p> <p>19 disease in question.</p> <p>20 So -- but having said that, I have</p> <p>21 no idea and no reason to believe that there</p> <p>22 have been changes in diagnostic practices or</p> <p>23 criteria over that period of time that would</p> <p>24 explain such an apparent decline.</p> <p>25 Q. You would agree that's good news</p>	<p>Page 135</p> <p>1 incidence rates of ovarian cancer, but I</p> <p>2 wouldn't affirm that.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. What's your basis for saying that</p> <p>5 the composition of talcum powder has changed</p> <p>6 since the 1980s?</p> <p>7 A. Well, I believe that the companies,</p> <p>8 I think Johnson & Johnson and other companies</p> <p>9 have proclaimed and offered alternatives to the</p> <p>10 mineral talc in their products and more of</p> <p>11 the -- what's it called -- corn -- sorry,</p> <p>12 sometimes words fall out of my vocabulary</p> <p>13 box -- corn starch -- no. It's corn starch,</p> <p>14 yeah.</p> <p>15 So that there's been an increase</p> <p>16 since about the 1980s -- at least that's what I</p> <p>17 read. I mean, I haven't done the research into</p> <p>18 this firsthand research; but everything I've</p> <p>19 read -- and I don't think it's contested -- is</p> <p>20 that there's been a shift away from the mineral</p> <p>21 talc to corn starch and maybe other products as</p> <p>22 well, other substances as well that have</p> <p>23 similar cosmetic effects as talc does.</p> <p>24 Q. What's the latency period for</p> <p>25 ovarian cancer?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 A. Well, as with any cancer, there's 2 no single number; but I think the range -- and 3 there -- it's hard to -- especially when you 4 don't have a good grasp on the important risk 5 factors for the disease, it's difficult to 6 affirm with any degree of certainty what the 7 latency period is.</p> <p>8 But the general feeling is that for 9 epithelial solid tumors, a range from 10 to 20 10 or 25 years is a reasonable estimate of what 11 the latency period is.</p> <p>12 But with cancer's, there may be 13 early-stage risk factors, later-stage risk 14 factors that -- that come into play. And these 15 influence latency periods in different ways. 16 But --</p> <p>17 Q. Have you done any sort of analysis 18 to determine whether there was a drop in the 19 use of talcum powder with the appropriate 20 latency that it would have affected the drop in 21 ovarian cancer rates over the last 30 years, or 22 are you just speculating?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I have not done an 25 analysis of this topic.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 You speculated, correct? 2 You were talking about how women 3 have moved away -- possibly have moved away 4 from talcum powder toward other compositions. 5 At first, you said it was other compositions of 6 talc, but now I think you mean other products 7 all together; and maybe that relates to the 8 precipitous decline in ovarian cancer.</p> <p>9 My question is: You don't have any 10 actual evidence for that, correct?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I mean, I think there 13 are pieces -- I haven't produced any 14 evidence of that, but I've read that 15 there's -- I've seen evidence that there's 16 a decline in usage of talcum powder.</p> <p>17 I've seen that there have been 18 changes over time in composition of the 19 products that are commonly called talcum 20 powder.</p> <p>21 And so but -- and there -- it's 22 widely accepted that there is the latency 23 period roughly between 10 and 20 years or 24 so, maybe 5 to 25 years if you want to 25 broaden it, which -- and for between</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. So fair to say that you're 3 speculating?</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I spoke for 6 about five minutes. I'm not sure which 7 part of it you are addressing.</p> <p>8 You're saying it's all -- 9 everything I've said is speculation?</p> <p>10 Is that what your -- asking me?</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. You speculated that maybe -- well, 13 first you said changes in talcum powder 14 composition, but then I think you said a move 15 away from talcum powder could have affected 16 precipitous decline in ovarian cancer rates.</p> <p>17 I'm asking you: Is that 18 speculation?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: If it's speculation 21 that there's been a drop -- a decline in 22 talcum powder use?</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. That would -- Doctor, it's not a 25 difficult question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 exposure and onset of disease.</p> <p>2 Latency period is a very 3 complicated -- it's an easy term to use, 4 but what it actually means is not obvious. 5 So I don't want to -- I hesitate answering 6 your question about latency period partly 7 for that question. But if you want me to, 8 I'll get into why it is so complicated.</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, could you try to 11 stick to the question.</p> <p>12 My question is: Sitting here 13 today, do you have any evidence that the 14 decline between 1990 and 2020 in ovarian cancer 15 rates relates to a decline in talcum powder 16 use?</p> <p>17 A. Okay.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: If that -- if that is 20 your question, then the answer is: I 21 don't have evidence for that.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>24 Doctor, you criticize in your 25 report a paper called Micha 2022.</p>

36 (Pages 138 - 141)

<p>1 Do you recall that?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. Let's -- let's find it.</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Page 78, just to move</p> <p>4 this along.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Micha '22, what --</p> <p>6 Noah, we're marking that as exhibit what?</p> <p>7 MR. EPSTEIN: That would be</p> <p>8 Exhibit 10.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>10 (Whereupon, Defendant's</p> <p>11 Exhibit D10, Paper entitled, "Talc powder</p> <p>12 and ovarian cancer: What is the</p> <p>13 evidence?" By John P. Micha, et al., was</p> <p>14 marked for identification.)</p> <p>15 MR. EPSTEIN: I'll put that in chat</p> <p>16 right you.</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: Great. With that</p> <p>18 new heading.</p> <p>19 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. "Talc powder and ovarian cancer: What is the evidence?" John Micha.</p> <p>22 Dr. Siemiatycki, do you know who</p> <p>23 John Micha is?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: We are just trying</p>	<p>Page 142</p> <p>1 disclose."</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A. I see that.</p> <p>4 Q. Are you aware that Susan Berg,</p> <p>5 whose family sponsored this paper, was actually</p> <p>6 a plaintiff in talc litigation?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>8 Completely misstates the evidence who</p> <p>9 Susan Berg was.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I'm unaware of any of</p> <p>11 this.</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And in contrast to</p> <p>14 Dr. Micha, Dr. Egilman who responded to this</p> <p>15 paper does have a conflict of interest,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of</p> <p>19 that.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. You're not aware that Dr. Egilman</p> <p>22 has a conflict of interest?</p> <p>23 A. Correct. Unless it's -- I'm not</p> <p>24 aware of it. It might have been in the paper.</p> <p>25 He might have stated it. I'll look at the</p>
<p>1 to grab --</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: While you're looking</p> <p>3 for the paper, I'm just asking if he knows</p> <p>4 who John Micha is.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Did you do any investigation as to</p> <p>8 whether Dr. Micha had any conflicts of interest</p> <p>9 here?</p> <p>10 A. I don't know who he is, and I</p> <p>11 didn't do any investigations.</p> <p>12 Q. Got it. Did you read who funded</p> <p>13 the paper?</p> <p>14 A. No, I didn't.</p> <p>15 Q. I'll read it to you. "This study</p> <p>16 was funded by the Women's Cancer Research</p> <p>17 Foundation, the family of Susan Berg, and the</p> <p>18 family of Joan and Len Rullo in memory of</p> <p>19 Elizabeth Johnson."</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 That's on the last page, funding.</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I see -- on the last page --</p> <p>23 oh, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. "The authors have no relevant</p> <p>25 financial or nonfinancial interests to</p>	<p>Page 143</p> <p>Page 145</p> <p>1 paper if you'd like.</p> <p>2 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, is serving in this</p> <p>3 litigation a conflict of interest that should</p> <p>4 be disclosed in the letter?</p> <p>5 A. It depends what the letter is</p> <p>6 about.</p> <p>7 Q. I don't understand. When you say</p> <p>8 Dr. Egilman didn't have a conflict of interest,</p> <p>9 are you aware that Dr. Egilman is a plaintiff's</p> <p>10 expert in talc litigation?</p> <p>11 A. I'm -- I'm unaware of that.</p> <p>12 Q. I see. Okay. We can continue.</p> <p>13 I'd like to turn to -- back to</p> <p>14 Exhibit 6, which is your expert report, and I'd</p> <p>15 like to go to your discussion of Wentzensen</p> <p>16 paper.</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: One moment.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Which one is it?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: The Wentzensen 2021.</p> <p>20 Right, Jessica?</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm just talking</p> <p>22 about -- let's -- Noah, can you please put</p> <p>23 up Exhibit 5 on the screen, page 76 of</p> <p>24 Dr. Siemiatycki's Second Amended Expert</p> <p>25 Report?</p>

1 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. That's 2 Exhibit 6, correct, Jessica? 3 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, sorry. Sorry. 4 Exhibit 6. Confusion. 5 MR. EPSTEIN: It should be up now. 6 THE WITNESS: I have -- I have the 7 report in front of me. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. I'd like to ask you a question 10 about your report. 11 You say here, quote, "They debunked 12 the notion expressed by Goodman 2020, Lynch 13 2023, and others that cohorts studies as a 14 class are more valid than case control 15 studies." 16 Do you see that? 17 A. I see that. 18 Q. Can you show me where in the paper 19 they debunk that? 20 A. I'll have to look at the paper. 21 It'll take me a few minutes. 22 So I'm looking at the article -- 23 Q. Uh-huh. 24 A. -- and on page 4 of the version 25 that I have, but it would be on the -- can you	Page 146 1 which is not true. 2 And that's the point I was trying 3 to make only that they made -- they 4 debunked the notions that these are 5 generic general truths that cohort studies 6 are superior to case control studies. 7 It's the specifics of each type of 8 study -- of each study that determines 9 its quality, not whether it fits under 10 the umbrella of cohort or case control. 11 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 12 Q. Do Goodman 2020 and Lynch 2023 13 state that cohort studies have no limitations? 14 A. Do they state what? 15 Q. That cohort studies have no 16 limitations. 17 A. I'll have to go through the two 18 studies to see where -- what I'm contrasting 19 where -- 20 Q. I'm just asking you whether you 21 recall. Obviously we don't have time to go 22 through those two studies. 23 Do you recall whether these two 24 papers state that cohort studies have no 25 limitations?
Page 147 1 find page 4? 2 Q. Sure. 3 A. It's 4.2 called "Study Designs." 4 Q. Uh-huh. 5 A. There are a few paragraphs there 6 that contrast the strengths and weaknesses of 7 case control versus cohort studies. 8 Q. Uh-huh. 9 A. And the -- 10 Q. Can you just point me to the 11 sentence that, quote, "debunks the notion that 12 cohort studies as a class are more valid"?	Page 149 1 A. I don't recall such statements; but 2 if I put this -- 3 Q. Okay. 4 A. -- into this report I probably -- 5 it was probably based on the impression that I 6 got by reading the entirety of the article that 7 they were downplaying the validity of case 8 control studies by contrast with cohort 9 studies. So it's based on an impression of the 10 entire articles, not a specific sentence. 11 Q. In fact, O'Brien and Wentzensen 12 published the most comprehensive meta-analysis 13 of cohort studies, correct? 14 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 15 THE WITNESS: Sorry. O'Brien 16 published the most comprehensive -- sorry. 17 Can you repeat that. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Isn't it true that O'Brien and 20 Wentzensen themselves published the most 21 comprehensive meta-analysis of cohort studies? 22 A. Of the available cohort studies on 23 talc and ovarian cancer, correct. 24 Q. That's what we're discussing today. 25 Thank you.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 If you go few lines down in your 2 report, you say that, "Women with intact 3 reproductive systems and used -- that the 4 authors found that women with intact 5 reproductive systems and used talcum powder had 6 particularly high risks of ovarian cancer."</p> <p>7 Do you see that language?</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: And, again, he was 9 going to the article.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. We're on page 76 of your report.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: 76.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. It says, "Women with intact 15 reproductive systems and used talcum powder had 16 particularly high risks of ovarian cancer."</p> <p>17 Do you see that language, 18 "particularly high"?</p> <p>19 A. Oh, yes. I see that now.</p> <p>20 Q. Can you show me where in the 21 Wentzensen paper it says that, "Women with 22 intact reproductive systems had particularly 23 high risks of ovarian cancer"?</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Wentzensen study.</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: I'm handing him the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 A. No. 2 Q. That sentence says that 3 epidemiological studies have found that women 4 with talc -- with intact reproductive systems 5 and who used talcum powder have particularly 6 high risks of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: He was trying to 8 answer.</p> <p>9 Go ahead, Doctor.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: So if I carry on 11 reading in the Wentzensen paper, it says, 12 "As described below, many of these 13 existing studies have attempted to look at 14 this in some way. However, most were 15 unable to do so with a clear temporal 16 sequence between hysterectomy, tubal 17 ligation, and powder use. For example, it 18 may not be possible to know whether talc 19 was used prior to hysterectomy and tubal 20 ligation or what a woman's combined talc 21 use status was."</p> <p>22 So that's indicating that the -- 23 that there's been insufficient research 24 to -- to sort of lock up this topic, 25 but --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 Wentzensen study.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: So in -- on page -- 3 I'm looking for a page number. I think 4 page 7 --</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>7 A. -- above Table 3 --</p> <p>8 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>9 A. -- there's a Section 5.3. It says, 10 "Patients of genital powder use and ovarian 11 cancer by tubal ligation and hysterectomy 12 and" --</p> <p>13 Q. I'm there.</p> <p>14 A. Okay. So a few lines down it 15 says -- well, "As such, it would make sense 16 that women who did not have uterus, either i.e., 17 hysterectomy or those who had blocked fallopian 18 tubes, would have a markedly reduced risk of 19 developing the disease as a direct consequence 20 of talc use."</p> <p>21 There are a few other sentences 22 around it, but that sentence captures, I think, 23 the meaning of my sentence that you --</p> <p>24 Q. So that sentence says that the 25 studies have found --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. But that's not what you say, 3 Doctor.</p> <p>4 What you say in your report is 5 that, "The data tend to show that women with 6 intact reproductive systems and used talcum 7 powder have particularly high risks of ovarian 8 cancer."</p> <p>9 I'm trying to understand -- I've 10 got the report in front of me, the papers at -- 11 the paper in front of me too.</p> <p>12 I'm trying to understand where from 13 Wentzensen do you derive that the authors 14 believed the data show that women who used 15 talcum powder and have intact reproductive 16 systems have particularly high risks?</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, you may not 18 have heard. He was still talking when you 19 started to talk again. So please, let him 20 finish.</p> <p>21 And I realize this is very 22 difficult and challenging being remote, 23 but he was actually talking.</p> <p>24 You're going to have to raise your 25 voice as well, Doctor.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: But please continue</p> <p>3 your thought and opinion.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: So as such, it would</p> <p>5 make sense they say that women who did not</p> <p>6 have intact reproductive systems would --</p> <p>7 would have a reduced risk of developing.</p> <p>8 So if it was blocked, there would</p> <p>9 be a reduced risk of talc particles</p> <p>10 reaching the ovaries. And my sentence</p> <p>11 says -- so with the intact reproductive</p> <p>12 systems and the lack of blockage from --</p> <p>13 from any surgical interventions, that</p> <p>14 there would be -- oh, particularly high</p> <p>15 risks.</p> <p>16 Yes. So with intact reproductive</p> <p>17 systems, there would be greater chance of</p> <p>18 particles reaching the ovaries.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. What you say here is that, "The few</p> <p>21 studies that have data tend to show that women</p> <p>22 with intact reproductive systems had</p> <p>23 particularly high risks."</p> <p>24 "The few studies that had data."</p> <p>25 Where do Wentzensen and O'Brien say</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. Sorry. Can you -- can you show me</p> <p>3 where -- where is that last -- yes. I'm in the</p> <p>4 conclusions section, which is --</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, can you put</p> <p>6 the conclusion of Wentzensen up?</p> <p>7 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. I'm on it right</p> <p>8 now.</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Thanks, Noah.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. We're in the second</p> <p>12 paragraph of the conclusion.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Blow it up, the</p> <p>14 paragraph that starts with "Taken</p> <p>15 together. Blow it up, Noah.</p> <p>16 MR. EPSTEIN: I don't know how to</p> <p>17 do it through Zoom. I'm sorry.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Anyway the authors say, "Taken</p> <p>21 together, the epidemiological data from case</p> <p>22 control studies and cohort studies suggests</p> <p>23 that there may be a small positive association</p> <p>24 between genital powder use and ovarian cancer</p> <p>25 which may be limited to women with patent</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 that the few studies that had data tend to show</p> <p>2 particularly high risks of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>3 A. So the article says they were</p> <p>4 unable to demonstrate this with a clear</p> <p>5 temporal sequence. This article is not -- does</p> <p>6 not make the bold statement that I make in</p> <p>7 describing the Wentzensen article.</p> <p>8 Q. Doctor --</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. -- in fact, don't they say only</p> <p>11 there may be a small positive association</p> <p>12 between genital powder use and ovarian cancer,</p> <p>13 which may be limited to women with patent</p> <p>14 reproductive tracts?</p> <p>15 Isn't that what they say on page 8?</p> <p>16 A. Sorry. Can you --</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Page 8.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. In their conclusion, the authors</p> <p>21 state, "There may be a small positive</p> <p>22 association between genital powder use and</p> <p>23 ovarian cancer, which may be limited to women</p> <p>24 with patent reproductive tracts."</p> <p>25 That's what they actually say,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 reproductive tracts."</p> <p>2 I read that correctly, right,</p> <p>3 Dr. Siemiatycki?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So rather than saying anything</p> <p>6 about a particularly high risk, the authors</p> <p>7 actually say "small positive association,"</p> <p>8 right?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: So terms like "small"</p> <p>11 and "high" are not technically defined. I</p> <p>12 mean, they don't have -- carry with them</p> <p>13 any implication of what exactly that means</p> <p>14 in terms of the magnitude. And whether</p> <p>15 you call something -- an effect large or</p> <p>16 small is rather subjective, and it doesn't</p> <p>17 mean the same thing in all contexts.</p> <p>18 So yes, they use the words "small"</p> <p>19 positive association" here; but for many</p> <p>20 associations that we have in biomedicine</p> <p>21 and epidemiology and even in talc -- in</p> <p>22 ovarian cancer epidemiology, there are</p> <p>23 effects which have relative risks much</p> <p>24 smaller than the relative risks shown for</p> <p>25 ovarian -- for talc and ovarian cancer</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 158</p> <p>1 that are considered quite strong effects. 2 There are very genetic markers that 3 have associations with ovarian cancer 4 where the relative risks are in the order 5 of 1.05 or something like that. And, you 6 know, air pollution has that affect on 7 lung cancer. 8 And so the descriptor, the word 9 that you use to describe the magnitude of 10 a relative risk is somewhat subjective and 11 context dependent. 12 So if I understand your question 13 correctly, you are trying to show that 14 whereas they use the word "small" to 15 describe the association, I used the 16 word -- let me find it again. 17 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 18 Q. "Particularly high risk," Doctor. 19 I'm trying to -- 20 A. Yeah. 21 MS. PARFITT: Let him finish. 22 THE WITNESS: What I mentally 23 "particularly high" was particularly high 24 compared with women with surgical 25 interventions to interrupt the -- the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 160</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. The authors did not note that, 3 correct? 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 5 answered. 6 THE WITNESS: Well, I'll look 7 through the article again to see what 8 triggered my interpretation that they had 9 made such an inference. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Okay. Doctor, if you look at the 12 top of page 9 of Wentzensen, the authors state, 13 "Independent of the underlying cause, this 14 association between powder use and ovarian 15 cancer risk is weak. The low relative risk 16 translates to a very low risk increase." 17 Do you see that? 18 A. I see that. 19 Do you want me to comment on it? 20 Q. No. I'm just asking if you see 21 that language. 22 A. I see it. 23 Q. This paragraph 2 does not have any 24 reference or notation to a particularly high 25 risk, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 159</p> <p>1 potential entry of talc particles. 2 And so in the contrast, I can't 3 remember what it is; but if I remember, if 4 the overall relative risk is, you know, in 5 the order of 1.3 for talc and ovarian 6 cancer, it might be that that -- that 7 combines a relative risk of 1.4 or 1.5 for 8 women with intact reproductive tracts 9 compared to maybe 1.1 or 1.2 for women 10 without. 11 And so that's the contrast -- 12 that's what I meant by "particularly," by 13 contrast with women without intact 14 reproductive tracts, and that's -- so the 15 descriptor "high" was in the comparison of 16 the two groups of women. 17 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 18 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, in fact, the 19 authors did not note that women with intact 20 reproductive systems who used talcum powder had 21 particularly high risks of ovarian cancer, 22 right? 23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 24 answered. 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 161</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 2 answered. 3 THE WITNESS: Correct. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you. Let's go 5 off the record. 6 (Whereupon, a lunch was taken.) 7 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's mark as 8 Exhibit 11 "Douching and Genital Talc Use: 9 Patterns of Use and Reliability of 10 Self-reported Exposure," first author 11 O'Brien. 12 MS. PARFITT: It was hard to hear 13 you, Jessica. I'm sorry. 14 MS. DAVIDSON: It's called 15 "Douching and Genital Talc Use: Patterns 16 of Use and Reliability of Self-reported 17 Exposure," first author O'Brien. 18 MS. PARFITT: Give us one moment. 19 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry? 20 MS. PARFITT: Give us one moment. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: No problem. We'll 22 put it up on the screen. 23 24 25</p>

1 (Whereupon, Defendant's 2 Exhibit D11, Paper entitled, "Douching and 3 Genital Talc Use: Patterns of Use and 4 Reliability of Self-reported Exposure," by 5 Katie M. O'Brien, et al., was marked for 6 identification.) 7 MR. TISI: I'm just trying to give 8 him -- 9 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, it's the 10 "Perineal talc use and" -- 11 MR. TISI: No. It's the Patterns 12 and Reliability the self-exposure. 13 MS. DAVIDSON: "Douching and 14 Genital Talc Use: Patterns of Use and 15 Reliability of Self-reported Exposure." 16 MR. TISI: Hold on. Let me see if 17 I can get another copy. All I have is the 18 preprint. Let me see if I have another 19 copy. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. Dr. Wentzensen [sic], have you read 22 this article before? 23 MS. PARFITT: You mean 24 Dr. Siemiatycki. 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, I'm sorry.	Page 162	1 parameters of talc use and douching in 2 that population. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Do you recall that the authors were 5 looking at questions of recall bias? 6 A. Yes. It's in the title, so I 7 recall that. 8 Q. And what do the authors determine; 9 do you recall? 10 A. I don't recall. 11 Q. Okay. Dr. Siemiatycki -- 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. -- the authors state, "If historic 14 use cannot be accurately recalled, measurement 15 error can bias effect estimates, especially if 16 recall reliability differs by outcome status." 17 Do you agree with that statement? 18 A. So I didn't catch all of what you 19 said. 20 Could you -- 21 Q. It's right here on page 1. 22 A. Okay. 23 Q. It's up on the screen. 24 A. Yeah. 25 Q. On the right-hand, the last	Page 164
1 Yeah. I'm definitely running out of steam 2 here. I'm so sorry. 3 MS. PARFITT: No worries. No 4 worries. No worries. 5 MS. DAVIDSON: Fortunately, no 6 contagion on Zoom. 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, have you read this 9 article before? 10 A. I think I have. 11 Q. What is does this article address? 12 A. Well, patterns of use and 13 reliability of self-reported exposure of 14 douching and genital talc use by women. 15 Q. Do you know what the paper looks 16 at? 17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 18 THE WITNESS: I'm just -- I'm just 19 starting to look at the preprint version. 20 It's not one that I've looked at recently, 21 so it will just take me a minute to 22 refresh my memory about this one. 23 Oh, yes. It's from the 24 Sister Study. And it's kind of a 25 descriptive presentation of various	Page 163	1 sentence of the second paragraph on the right. 2 I'll read it again. 3 "If historic use cannot be 4 accurately recalled, measurement error can bias 5 effect estimates, especially if recall 6 reliability differs by outcome status." 7 Do you agree with that statement? 8 A. Yes. I still haven't found the 9 sentence on the page, but I agree with that 10 statement. 11 Q. This study looked at recall bias 12 with respect to ever use and never use, 13 correct? 14 A. I guess so. Again, this article is 15 not fresh in my memory and -- 16 Q. Okay. 17 A. -- I'm -- I'm just looking at -- 18 Q. Could -- my question is: Could 19 recall bias also affect reporting of the 20 frequency of use of a product? 21 A. Yes, it could. 22 Q. So if you -- do you recall whether 23 O'Brien's paper found that there may be 24 over-reporting of talc use among those with a 25 history of ovarian cancer?	Page 165

42 (Pages 162 - 165)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, for 2 clarity, are you still talking about this 3 douching paper or a different O'Brien 4 paper, just for clarity?</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm talking about 6 this paper, I believe.</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Okay. No. That's 8 fine. That's fine.</p> <p>9 It was really faint, Jessica. I'm 10 sorry. I know you don't -- you're not 11 feeling well, but you're really faint. 12 Okay.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Do the authors of this paper find 17 that there may be over-reporting of talc use 18 among those with a history of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>19 A. You know, I -- I can't -- I can't 20 remember, to be honest. I can't remember 21 this --</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. -- particularly well.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. That's fair.</p> <p>25 Do you recall the author saying</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 bias in that; and I had a discussion of the 2 possible impact that it might have. 3 So I felt -- I feel like I already 4 dealt with this issue in my report. I -- I 5 don't know that this -- this publication 6 changed anything for my report.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I'd like to 8 mark as Exhibit 12 a paper entitled, "Use 9 of personal care product mixtures and 10 incident hormone-sensitive cancers in the 11 Sister Study: A U.S.-wide prospective 12 cohort," first author Chang. (Whereupon, Defendant's 13 Exhibit D12, Paper entitled, "Use of 14 personal care product mixtures and 15 incident hormone-sensitive cancers in the 16 Sister Study: A U.S.-wide prospective 17 cohort," by Che-Jung Chang, et al., was 18 marked for identification.)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: C-H-I-A-N-G-E.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. C-H-A-N-G.</p> <p>22 A. I'm getting it. It will just take 23 a second before we find it.</p> <p>24 Q. Does the paper name sound familiar</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 that, "Recall bias is potentially driving some 2 of the previous observed differences in effect 3 estimates between studies collecting genital 4 powder exposure status retrospectively versus 5 prospectively"?</p> <p>6 A. So I don't recall that.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 A. But I don't disagree that it's 9 potentially true.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. The qualifier potentially's the key 12 word in -- in that sentence.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you include a discussion of 14 this paper in your -- in your report?</p> <p>15 A. Of this paper?</p> <p>16 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 A. You know, I don't remember if I did 18 or not.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay.</p> <p>20 A. I didn't think that it moved of the 21 dial in any way compared to what I already had 22 in the paper. You know, I had a section in my 23 paper -- in my report about different kinds of 24 biases that can affect different kinds of 25 epidemiologic studies, and I included reporting</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p> <p>1 to you?</p> <p>2 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>3 Q. Does the paper name sound familiar 4 to you?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, vaguely; but again, not fresh 6 in my mind.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall when you read it?</p> <p>8 A. Sorry. Did you say -- did you ask 9 something?</p> <p>10 Q. Do you recall when you read this 11 paper?</p> <p>12 A. No, I don't, not right now. Not 13 before having seen it. If you can hang on for 14 a couple of minutes, I think we're looking for 15 it.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Is it missing?</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: We'll put it up on 18 the screen, Noah.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: If you can go -- if 20 you could go ahead and -- thank you very 21 much -- put it up.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: I believe this paper 23 was in the materials you sent us in the 24 Dropbox, Michelle, correct?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: Correct. That's</p>

1 correct, yes. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: So I'm asking the 3 doctor when he read it. 4 MS. PARFITT: Yes. The distinction 5 we were making, he's got three binders of 6 articles here; and it is not in his 7 binder. I don't know if it's in the 8 miscellaneous materials that we got. 9 THE WITNESS: I don't remember when 10 I looked at this. It wasn't an important 11 paper in my evaluation. 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. Does this paper report a risk 14 estimate for exposure to perineal talc use and 15 the development of ovarian cancer? 16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 17 If you want to show him what 18 you're -- 19 THE WITNESS: I have to read it. I 20 have to read it. I'm sorry. I just 21 don't -- I'm not familiar enough with the 22 article, and I don't remember it very 23 well. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Okay. It was on your reliance	Page 170	1 And if you can point me to where 2 this is an important article with important 3 results, I will certainly consider it if I'm 4 called upon to comment on this again. 5 Q. So your testimony is that it's in 6 your materials considered list, but you never 7 actually read it? 8 A. I looked at it in some form, maybe 9 looked at the abstract; but, you know, of the 10 hundreds and hundreds of articles I've looked 11 at in abstracts on this topic and other topics 12 in the past year, I can't say that this one 13 stuck out in any way. 14 Q. All right. Let's turn to Table S4. 15 A. To where? 16 Q. Table S4. 17 A. Of this article, okay. 18 Q. Correct. 19 A. I don't have the article in front 20 of me so -- 21 Q. We're going to put it up on the 22 screen. Don't worry. 23 A. Yeah. 24 MS. DAVIDSON: We're going to mark 25 Table S4 as Exhibit 13.	Page 172
1 list, and it came out in 2024. 2 So you read it pretty recently, 3 correct? 4 MS. PARFITT: It was on materials 5 considered, Jessica, not on reliance. 6 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 7 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, this was on your 8 materials considered list and it came out in 9 2024. 10 So you read it pretty recently, 11 correct? 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 13 THE WITNESS: Not correct. 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Well, when did you read it? 16 A. Well, I don't think I read it. I 17 think I glanced at it, decided it was not 18 important to write up or review. So I -- 19 Q. How do you decide that a paper's 20 not important to review just by glancing at 21 it without reading it in full? 22 A. You have to make such decisions 23 when you're reviewing, you know, an enormous 24 volume of material, which ones to go further 25 and dig into and which ones to set aside.	Page 171	1 Noah, it is the Supplemental 2 Table S4. 3 MR. EPSTEIN: Yeah. Sorry about 4 that. Let me pull that up. 5 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's mark that as 6 Exhibit 13. 7 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit 8 D13, Supplemental Table S4, was marked for 9 identification.) 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Table S4, which we're putting up on 12 the screen, is titled -- 13 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, it's not up 14 yet, just so you know. 15 MS. DAVIDSON: I know. I know. 16 I'm just -- I'm not asking any questions 17 yet. I'm just telling you. 18 Table S4, which is being put up on 19 the screen is entitled, "Associations 20 between one-frequency category increase in 21 use of single personal care product and 22 breast, ovarian, and uterine cancer using 23 Cox proportional hazards models." 24 Noah, I would like to look at the 25 middle column, which is ovarian cancer.	Page 173

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 So can you below that up and focus on 2 that. 3 MR. EPSTEIN: I've looked. I don't 4 see a way to blow it up. 5 MS. DAVIDSON: There is a way, but 6 okay. 7 MR. EPSTEIN: Sorry about that. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: Did you ask -- do 9 you ask someone? 10 MR. EPSTEIN: I've reached out to 11 Asher. I haven't heard back. 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Ask a 13 paralegal. 14 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Looking at the bottom -- we'll all 17 just have to strain our eyes a little. 18 In the bottom middle column, it 19 lists for several hygiene products an adjusted 20 hazard ratio for ovarian cancer. 21 Do you see that? 22 It's also been e-mailed to you in 23 the chat if you want to open it up there. 24 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I would just 25 object to the extent the doctor has</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 Can you -- are you able to increase 2 it? 3 MR. LYONS: I mean, if you want me 4 to share, I can zoom. So I've got the 5 document if you want me to share. 6 MS. DAVIDSON: Patrick, do you know 7 how to do it? 8 MR. LYONS: Yes. 9 MS. DAVIDSON: Great. Let's have 10 Patrick do it. 11 MR. LYONS: If that will be 12 helpful. 13 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes. That would be 14 amazing, Patrick. 15 So you're going to put -- Patrick, 16 you're going to put up Table S4, the 17 middle table on ovarian cancer. 18 Thank you so much. 19 Michelle, he's useful. You're 20 lucky. 21 Okay. Patrick, we want to go to 22 the bottom. Okay. And then we're looking 23 at -- right. We're looking at adjusted 24 hazard ratios for bath gel, deodorant, 25 douche, mouthwash, shaving scream.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 already testified. He looked at an 2 abstract. He has not reviewed this 3 article --</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: I understand, but 5 I'm -- I'm showing you --</p> <p>6 MR. TISI: Do you mind if I can go 7 behind him and see if I can download --</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Well, do you guys 9 want to just print -- do you want to go 10 off the record and print this?</p> <p>11 MR. TISI: We're not in a place 12 where we can do that, Jessica.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, okay.</p> <p>14 MR. TISI: I'm seeing if I go to 15 the chat --</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: On my computer I'm 17 able to just -- to zoom in.</p> <p>18 MR. TISI: Yeah. He can't do that 19 unless he downloads the document.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: On my table I can 21 just go on my Zoom, interestingly enough, 22 and just -- on my computer, I can increase 23 it.</p> <p>24 MR. TISI: Let's see if we can do 25 that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 And then if you turn to the next 2 page, talc underarm, talc vaginal, and 3 talc other.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. So I'd like to ask you, 6 Dr. Siemiatycki, of these hygiene products, 7 bath gel, deodorant, douche, mouthwash, shaving 8 cream, talc underarm, and talc vaginal, do any 9 show an age-adjusted hazard ratio that's 10 statistically significant with ovarian cancer?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection to the 12 question.</p> <p>13 The doctor's testified he has not 14 had a chance to review the entire article, 15 and he has not relied on it for the 16 purposes of this --</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: I understand. We're 18 just looking at this table, Michelle.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Well, from just the 20 table, I wouldn't venture a guess as to 21 how -- what I would think if I saw the 22 whole paper.</p> <p>23 Just as an example -- this is from 24 the Sister Study, correct?</p> <p>25 In the original publication of the</p>

1 Sister Study, the published result on 2 perineal use of talc and ovarian cancer 3 showed a relative risk of .73. 4 In the analysis of the Sister Study 5 data by the O'Brien team, they found that 6 the Sister Study data actually showed a 7 relative risk of 1.05. 8 So depending on who did the 9 analysis and how they did the analysis, 10 there's an enormous change in the point 11 estimate. 12 I don't know what this data was 13 based on that you're showing me here in 14 this article. I would need to look at it 15 and understand what -- what subjects it 16 was based on, what subsets of the 17 Sister Study cohort it was based on, what 18 the methods were. So I really can't 19 answer the questions about it. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, you're refusing to 22 tell me which of the risk ratios that are 23 listed here are statistically significant? 24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 25 THE WITNESS: I could -- I could --	Page 178 1 A. I see that. 2 Q. Okay. Let's go back down. 3 The adjusted hazard ratio for bath 4 gel is not statistically significant at the 5 95-percent confidence interval, correct? 6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 7 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. And the same is true for deodorant 10 mouthwash, shaving cream, talc underarm, and 11 talc vaginal, correct? 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 13 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. And the only -- the only 16 statistically significant -- 17 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, let me -- 18 THE WITNESS: I don't endorse that 19 those are valid statements. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. I understand. But, you know, 22 that's not my question, with all due respect. 23 And you're happy -- I'm happy for 24 you. When Ms. Parfitt questions you, you can 25 go on and on why you don't endorse this paper,
1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. If you're refusing, just tell me 3 that. 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection to the 5 response. 6 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 7 Q. I asked you in this paper do the 8 authors -- well, let's start with bath gel. 9 Is the adjusted hazard ratio for 10 bath gel and ovarian cancer statistically 11 significant? 12 A. Well, one thing, I don't know which 13 is the adjusted. 14 Q. Right here, it says it, 1.06. 15 There's -- 16 A. It doesn't say it on my screen. 17 Q. It's at the top of the page, 18 Doctor. 19 A. Well, the top of the page is not 20 visible. 21 Q. We're happy to show it to you 22 again. We showed it to you already. 23 It says, "Adjusted -- age-adjusted 24 hazard ratio 95 percent confidence interval." 25 Do you see that, Doctor?	Page 179 1 but my question is very simple. 2 The only statistically significant 3 hazard ratio in this column is for douching, 4 correct? 5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 6 And you aren't letting him finish the 7 answer. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I understand. 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, the only adjusted 11 hazard ratio that is statistically significant 12 is for douching, correct? 13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 14 THE WITNESS: If by "statistically 15 significant," you mean the confidence 16 interval -- the 95-percent confidence 17 interval does not include one, then that's 18 correct. 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. For douching it shows a 1.37; 21 whereas, for talc vaginal, it shows 1.07 22 correct? 23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 24 He's already testified. He cannot -- 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I understand,

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 Michelle. You can have a standing 2 objection to this document. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. For douching shows 1.37 compared to 5 talc vaginal at 1.07, correct? 6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 7 THE WITNESS: That's what this 8 table -- these numbers in this table show. 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. Correct. And I'm asking you about 11 this table. That's all I'm asking you about. 12 And for bath and -- 13 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I don't want 14 to talk over you. 15 MS. DAVIDSON: No. I'm not having 16 speeches about this. I'm asking questions 17 about this document. 18 You can ask him all the questions 19 you want about -- about this paper. 20 MS. PARFITT: He's -- 21 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 22 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, am I correct 23 that -- am I correct that the adjusted hazard 24 ratio for bath gel is 1.06 and for talc is 25 1.07; is that correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Okay. Let's go back to the 5 Wentzensen, O'Brien paper 2021. 6 MR. EPSTEIN: I can take over from 7 here. Thank you. I figured out the 8 zooming. I apologize. 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. Oh, Dr. Siemiatycki, you noted 11 earlier that O'Brien had a different risk ratio 12 for the Sister Study than was originally 13 reported in Gonzalez, right? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And one reason for that is that 16 O'Brien had more years of data, right? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And the 1.05 risk ratio for the 19 Sister -- for the Sister Study reported in 20 O'Brien was not statistically significant at 21 the 95-percent confidence interval, correct? 22 A. Correct. 23 Q. Okay. If we could look at 24 Wentzensen, O'Brien, going back to -- 25 MR. TISI: I'm trying to get it, so</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Dr. Siemiatycki, 2 would you answer the in the fashion you 3 have been attempting to answer it but have 4 been obstructed by counsel from giving 5 your answer. 6 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 7 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, am I correct that 8 in this table the adjusted hazard ratio for 9 bath gel is not statistically significant at 10 1.06, and the adjusted hazard ratio for vaginal 11 talc is not statistically significant at 1.07, 12 correct? 13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 14 Answer as in fulsome a manner as 15 you need to answer the question 16 accurately. 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Thank you. And the confidence 20 intervals for bath gel and for vaginal talc 21 use, the confidence intervals listed on this 22 table overlap significantly, right -- or 23 considerably, to use the language you used 24 before? 25 They overlap considerably, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 just give him a second. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 3 MR. TISI: Thank you. 4 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 5 Q. I just have one question on this 6 paper. 7 Dr. Siemiatycki, did the confidence 8 intervals in O'Brien 2021 for the risk ratio 9 for women with patent tubes versus women with 10 non patent tubes, did those confidence 11 intervals overlap considerably? 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 13 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I don't know 14 which paper we're talking about or which 15 table we're talking about. 16 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 17 Q. In the Wentzensen and O'Brien paper 18 2021, that's what we've been talking about. 19 I'm asking you: Did the confidence 20 intervals reported by those authors for women 21 with patent tubes and women who didn't have 22 patent tubes, did they overlap considerably? 23 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, which table 24 are you referring to? 25 He's trying to orient himself.</p>

1 THE WITNESS: Are you waiting for 2 me to answer a question? 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Yes, of course. 5 MS. PARFITT: All right. We 6 thought -- 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. There's a question pending. 9 Have you forgotten the question? 10 MS. PARFITT: He did. 11 Suzanne, could you read that. 12 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. I'm 13 talking to him, Michelle. 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, have you forgotten 16 my question? 17 A. I thought that you were going to 18 point me to a table. I don't know which data 19 you are -- the question pertains to. I thought 20 you were going to indicate -- 21 Q. Doctor, you -- you included the 22 Wentzensen paper in your report, right? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Okay. I assume you read it, 25 correct?	Page 186 1 immunological data from case control 2 studies and cohort studies suggests that 3 there may be a small positive association 4 between genital powder use and ovarian 5 cancer. The causal factors underlying the 6 association are not clear. Proposed 7 factors include talc, other minerals." 8 Do you want me to continue reading 9 their conclusion? 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. I didn't ask you to read the 12 conclusions. 13 I asked you whether the confidence 14 intervals reported in this paper for patent 15 women overlap with the confidence interval 16 reported in this paper for non patent women. 17 A. I don't see -- 18 Q. It is a simple question. 19 A. I don't see the results that you're 20 alluding to. I don't see results for patent -- 21 I think we're talking about different papers. 22 MR. TISI: Which paper are you 23 talking about? 24 We have the Wentzensen 2021. 25 THE WITNESS: Wentzensen,
Page 187 1 A. Correct. 2 Q. And you're aware that it provides 3 risk ratios for patent women and non patent 4 women, right? 5 A. Can you show me which table you're 6 referring to? 7 Q. I'm not referring to a table. I'm 8 asking you what the results are of the study. 9 A. I'm asking you which table you are 10 referring to. You're talking about relative 11 risks and overlapping confidence intervals. I 12 don't know what to look at. 13 Q. Do you know what the results were 14 of the Wentzensen study? 15 MS. PARFITT: Different question. 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 MS. PARFITT: New question, Doctor. 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, I'll 19 look at the final conclusion of their 20 paper, and we went through this paper 21 15 minutes ago. And -- let me go to the 22 abstract, which often has a concise 23 statement of the findings or the 24 conclusions. 25 So they say, "Taken together via	Page 189 1 O'Brien -- 2 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 3 Q. Excuse me. I don't know who's 4 talking to you, but we don't have lawyers 5 talking to witnesses during a deposition. 6 MR. TISI: Well, no. I'm actually 7 talking to you. I'm trying to figure 8 out -- 9 MS. DAVIDSON: Hey, don't talk to 10 me because Michelle's defending this 11 deposition. 12 MR. TISI: Fine. Michelle, would 13 you ask -- 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki -- 16 MR. TISI: -- what she's referring 17 to? 18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Hold on. 19 Guys -- 20 MR. TISI: I'm trying -- I'm trying 21 to help you. 22 MS. DAVIDSON: Cut. 23 MR. TISI: I'm trying to help you. 24 MS. DAVIDSON: You're not helping 25 me.

	Page 190	Page 192
1	MR. TISI: Okay.	1 Q. You don't see it in here?
2	MS. DAVIDSON: Thanks for your	2 Would you like to look at
3	help. I don't want it.	3 Wentzensen 2020 for that information?
4	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	4 A. Well, I'll look at whatever you
5	Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, can you tell me,	5 think I should look at, but I'm looking at the
6	sitting here, what the -- what the risk ratio	6 one you pointed me at five minutes ago; and I
7	reported in this paper was for patent women	7 can't find that -- those results.
8	versus non patent women and whether the	8 So just point me to the results,
9	confidence intervals overlapped?	9 and I'm happy to look at it.
10	If you can't, just say you can't.	10 Q. If you look on page 8, the authors
11	MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I think	11 state --
12	there's a little confusion because they're	12 A. Which -- which paper? Which paper?
13	not marked.	13 Q. The same one we've been on.
14	MS. DAVIDSON: Excuse me. There's	14 A. Okay, okay. Because you just
15	no confusion. I've asked the same	15 switched papers. But now you're back to the
16	question --	16 one we've been talking about. That's fine.
17	MS. PARFITT: There actually is.	17 Q. No, I didn't switch papers, Doctor.
18	MS. DAVIDSON: -- six times.	18 It says, "A history of genital
19	MS. PARFITT: He's -- we're making	19 powder use was associated with an increase of
20	sure you are talking about the Wentzensen,	20 developing incident ovarian cancer. Hazard
21	O'Brien because the one in his hand is	21 ratio 1.13. Confidence interval 1.01 to 1.26.
22	Wentzensen, O'Brien, "Talc, body powder,	22 This association was null among women who did
23	and ovarian cancer: a summary of the	23 not have patent tubes, 0.99 confidence interval
24	epidemiologic evidence."	24 .86 to 1.15."
25	Are we on the same article.	25 Do those confidence intervals
	Page 191	Page 193
1	MS. DAVIDSON: We are on the same	1 overlap?
2	article, Michelle.	2 A. I'm now looking for that sentence.
3	MS. PARFITT: Okay. That's good.	3 So page 8, the first column, I assume; and
4	Okay. That's all. That's good.	4 you're talking about the first full paragraph
5	Here you go.	5 on that -- in that column; is that where you're
6	THE WITNESS: And are you claiming	6 looking, or the second?
7	that there are results here showing the	7 Q. Can we make this easier?
8	association for women with patent	8 Do the -- does the confidence
9	reproductive tracts and non patent; is	9 interval of 1.01 to 1.26 overlap with a
10	that what you're saying?	10 confidence interval of .86 to 1.15?
11	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	11 A. Okay. Repeat that question.
12	Q. Well, you testified earlier that	12 Q. Does the confidence interval of
13	you wrote in your paper that these authors	13 1.01 to 1.26 overlap with the confidence
14	reported particularly high risk for patent	14 interval of .86 to 1.15?
15	women.	15 A. Yes.
16	So do you not recall whether	16 Q. Okay.
17	there -- this study actually has results for	17 MS. DAVIDSON: Now, let's go to
18	patent and non patent women?	18 O'Brien 2020, and let's mark that as
19	A. Well, as -- as this is a review	19 Exhibit --
20	article, it doesn't necessarily show numerical	20 MR. EPSTEIN: 14.
21	results for each study that they took into	21 MS. DAVIDSON: -- 14.
22	account. And I'm just looking to see whether	22
23	they have any numeric -- because you're asking	23
24	about numerical results, overlaps of confidence	24
25	intervals and things. And I at first glance --	25

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p> <p>1 (Whereupon, Defendant's 2 Exhibit D14, Paper entitled, "Association 3 of Powder Use in the Genital Area With 4 Risk of Ovarian Cancer," by Katie M. 5 O'Brien, PhD, et al., was marked for 6 identification.)</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Do you guys have 8 that paper in front of you?</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: We're getting it.</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, for 11 accuracy, you're talking about the O'Brien 12 paper entitled, "Association of Powder Use 13 in the Genital Area with Risk" --</p> <p>14 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm going to -- 15 yeah. I'm going to -- I'm going to mark 16 it as soon as Noah puts it up.</p> <p>17 Okay. So, Noah, what number are we 18 on?</p> <p>19 MR. EPSTEIN: This is Exhibit 14.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. You have it 21 right up there. This is great.</p> <p>22 Chris, you have to credit me with 23 this PDF naming idea.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Exhibit 14 is, "Association of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p> <p>1 A. Correct. 2 MS. PARFITT: He does. 3 MS. DAVIDSON: We can go to the 4 conclusion.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, are you looking 7 for -- for this in a hard copy?</p> <p>8 A. Yeah. I have the hard copy of this 9 page that's on the screen.</p> <p>10 So I don't see any -- I don't see 11 any tables. This is not a --</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Doctor, you're -- I assume 13 that you know how to read an epidemiological 14 paper, correct?</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure how to 17 answer that, but yes.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Can you tell me where in 20 this paper it reports confidence intervals for 21 patent and non patent women and whether those 22 confidence intervals overlap?</p> <p>23 A. I didn't hear that whole sentence. 24 Can I tell you where they are?</p> <p>25 Q. Uh-huh. You can't find the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p> <p>1 Powder Use in the Genital Area With Risk of 2 Ovarian Cancer," published in JAMA by O'Brien. 3 You're familiar with this paper, 4 right, Doctor?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And you've testified about this 7 before, and I just have one question for you on 8 this paper.</p> <p>9 On this paper do the confidence 10 intervals for patent women and non patent women 11 reported by this paper overlap?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry. Do they what?</p> <p>13 Q. Overlap. Do the confidence 14 intervals overlap?</p> <p>15 The same question I've been asking.</p> <p>16 A. You want to -- you want to point me 17 specifically to the results in the table, or 18 should I try to find them myself?</p> <p>19 Do you know in which table those 20 results are found?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: We're scrolling to 22 them right now.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. We're scrolling through -- you do 25 have the paper in front of you, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 confidence intervals and the reported -- 2 MS. PARFITT: We're having a hard 3 time hearing you between the remote nature 4 and his hearing issue, he is having a hard 5 time hearing you.</p> <p>6 I'm sorry. If you want to read it 7 back to him.</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: I don't know. He's 9 heard me all day.</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: No, no. Actually, he 11 hasn't. That's why I keep interrupting. 12 He hasn't, and my apologies for that; but 13 we are having an issue here.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: So you want me to 15 read through this page and find the 16 results that you are referring to?</p> <p>17 It will take me a minute to read 18 through the page, or do you want to say 19 specifically --</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. I am asking you: What are the 22 point estimates in confidence intervals 23 reported in this paper perineal talc use and 24 the development of ovarian cancer for patent 25 women versus non patent women?</p>

50 (Pages 194 - 197)

1 A. And it's on this page? 2 Q. It's in this paper. 3 A. It's in the paper. So it will take 4 me about 10 or 15 minutes to read -- 5 Q. It's going to take you 10 or 6 15 minutes to identify the risk ratios in this 7 paper? 8 A. To read -- because I would have 9 to -- unless you point me to a specific paper 10 or a page or a specific table and call them, I 11 will read from the beginning the entire paper 12 to try to find what is the nature of the 13 question. 14 I still don't understand the 15 question. You're asking me to find some 16 results in a paper, in an eight-page paper. 17 Q. I just want to make sure I 18 understand. 19 It would take you 10 or 15 minutes 20 to find the -- to find the risk -- the point 21 estimates reported by these authors? 22 A. Yes, or the ones that you are 23 referring to. 24 Q. Do you recall whether this paper -- 25 A. I'm sorry?	Page 198 1 know -- 2 Q. I'm not asking you to read my mind. 3 I'm asking you to read the paper. 4 A. Is the data that you're referring 5 to in Table 2? 6 Q. Doctor, I'm asking you to tell me 7 what this paper reports in terms of hazard 8 ratio for patent versus non patent women. I 9 don't care where in the paper you find it. 10 I'm just asking you: What does it 11 report, and do the confidence intervals 12 overlap? 13 A. Okay. 14 Q. Is that too hard? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: It's hard if I've got 17 to guess where the information is; but if 18 you have time, I'll read through the paper 19 and try to find that information. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. You would have to read this entire 22 paper in order to answer that question? 23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 24 THE WITNESS: To know which results 25 you're talking about, yes. I would have
Page 199 1 Q. Do you recall whether this paper 2 provided risk estimates for patent women versus 3 non patent women? 4 Do you recall that sitting here 5 today? 6 A. Well, I believe -- I believe it 7 did. I believe it did. I'm just looking 8 because this group published several papers in 9 a few years, and I'm not sure which results 10 were presented in which papers. So I'm just 11 going to look to see if I can find something in 12 this. 13 So I see in Figure -- in the figure 14 on page 54 some results separately by patent 15 and non patent women. 16 Q. Uh-huh. Are you looking at 17 Table 2? 18 A. No. I'm looking at the figure. 19 But if you -- 20 Q. Okay. 21 A. -- want me to look at Table 2 -- 22 Q. I don't care where you look, 23 Doctor. I just want the answer to my question. 24 I don't care where you look. 25 A. So I'm not a mind reader. I don't	Page 201 1 to at least skim through the entire paper 2 to know what you're talking about. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Doctor, when you read an 5 epidemiological paper, is that -- you're not -- 6 you're not familiar with how to identify risk 7 ratios from tables? 8 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 9 Misstates his testimony. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. I'm just trying to understand why 12 it would take you 15 minutes to tell me what 13 the hazard ratios are reported in this paper -- 14 A. Because -- 15 Q. -- which you covered in your 16 report. 17 A. Because a paper of three or four 18 thousand words with several paragraphs and 19 sections and sentences may have that 20 information that you are interested in buried 21 anywhere in the paper. So to find it, I need 22 to go through it. 23 Q. All right. Well -- 24 A. I don't understand why you can't 25 tell me on which page or table the numbers are

1 that you are asking me to comment on. 2 Q. I can point you to it if you really 3 cannot find it on your own. 4 MR. GOLOMB: Suzanne, how much time 5 is left? How much time is left? 6 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. One 7 second. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: Suzanne, let's go 9 off the record. 10 THE COURT REPORTER: We're off the 11 record. 12 (Discussion held off the record.) 13 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go back on the 14 record and let's turn to page 54 of 15 O'Brien. 16 THE WITNESS: 54? 17 MS. DAVIDSON: Uh-huh. 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. 19 MS. PARFITT: There was a question 20 pending, Jessica, when he went off camera 21 is that -- when you went off camera. 22 Is that question still pending are, 23 or are we starting over? 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, do you remember	Page 202 1 I read to you five minutes ago from the other 2 paper, aren't they? 3 A. I don't remember. 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 5 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 6 Q. Okay. And these two confidence 7 intervals overlap considerably, correct? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. Okay. Let's move on. 10 Dr. Siemiatycki, I wanted to mark 11 as our final exhibit a paper entitled, 12 "Quantitative recall bias analysis of the talc 13 and ovarian cancer association." First author 14 is Goodman. 15 (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit 16 D15, Paper entitled, "Quantitative recall 17 bias analysis of the talc and ovarian 18 cancer association," by Julie E. 19 Goodman, et al., was marked for 20 identification.) 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Noah, would you be 22 so kind as to put that in the chat and on 23 the screen. 24 MR. EPSTEIN: On it. 25 MS. PARFITT: Give us one moment
Page 203 1 the question? 2 A. I think you asked -- were asking if 3 I could describe and comment on the risk 4 estimates, the relative risk estimates for 5 women with patent reproductive tracts and women 6 without, not patent. 7 Q. Correct. And the answer is on 8 page 54, right? 9 A. Well, that's one of the places 10 where the answer -- an answer can be found to 11 that question. 12 Q. And as I read to you from the last 13 Wentzensen paper, it's actually the same. The 14 same numbers are reported here, right? 15 1.13 hazard ratio for patent woman 16 with a 1.01 to 1.26 confidence interval; and 17 for non patent women .99 with a .86 to a 1.15 18 confidence interval, correct? 19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 20 THE WITNESS: So I -- I don't 21 recall the question you asked before about 22 this; but yeah, those are the two numbers 23 that are in this table. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. And those are the same numbers that	Page 205 1 please. 2 MS. DAVIDSON: Sure. 3 MS. PARFITT: It's a different 4 article than the one talked about earlier, 5 and we'll have to look at the screen. He 6 doesn't have a copy of it. 7 THE WITNESS: This -- this is 8 very -- 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. We're marking this paper as 11 Exhibit 15, I believe. 12 Have you seen this paper before, 13 Dr. Siemiatycki? 14 A. I don't think I have. It looks 15 like it's a very new -- newly published one. 16 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, have you ever 17 done -- I'm sorry. I didn't turn my camera on. 18 That's not on purpose. 19 Have you ever done any analysis of 20 how much recall bias would be necessary to 21 attenuate the results of the talc ovarian 22 cancer studies to the null? 23 A. No. 24 Q. Have you ever seen any papers 25 analyzing that question?

1 A. To attenuate to the null? 2 Have I seen any papers? 3 I -- I don't recall any -- seeing 4 it, but it may be that I did; but I don't 5 recall. 6 Q. Okay. 7 MS. DAVIDSON: I believe I'm done, 8 but let's just go off the record for three 9 minutes for me to check my notes; and then 10 I'll turn you over to Michelle. 11 MS. PARFITT: Thank you, Jessica. 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 13 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, are you aware that 16 your testimony today is on behalf of six 17 specific Bellwether plaintiffs who've been 18 chosen for trial in the MDL proceeding? 19 A. No, I am not aware. 20 Q. Have you ever heard the names 21 Ms. Converse, Ms. Newsome, or Ms. Rausa? 22 A. No, I haven't. 23 Q. Have you ever heard the names 24 Ms. Carl or Ms. Balderrama? 25 A. No, I haven't.	Page 206	1 So I do want to apologize and thank you 2 for your time today. 3 MS. PARFITT: Oh, thank you, 4 Jessica. I appreciate that. We 5 understand you're not feeling well. 6 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 7 MS. PARFITT: Okay. I'm ready to 8 go, so why don't we -- 9 MS. DAVIDSON: Go ahead. 10 MS. PARFITT: All right. 11 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, can I ask 12 a favor? 13 MS. PARFITT: Of course. 14 MS. DAVIDSON: Could we switch 15 the -- could we switch the microphone to 16 you because you are really hard to hear. 17 (Discussion held off the record.) 18 EXAMINATION 19 BY MS. PARFITT: 20 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, you'll recall that 21 several hours ago counsel for J&J asked you 22 some questions with regard to an EPA document 23 that recently came out banning chrysotile 24 asbestos. 25 Do you recall that series of	Page 208
1 Q. Have you looked at any records -- 2 any medical records or other documents related 3 to the plaintiffs in this -- in these cases? 4 A. No, I haven't. 5 Q. Do you know anything about the 6 plaintiff's in these cases usage of talcum 7 powder? 8 A. No, I don't. 9 Q. Do you know what other risk factors 10 any of these plaintiffs had for ovarian cancer? 11 A. No, I don't. 12 Q. Are you offering an opinion that 13 talcum powder use caused any specific women to 14 develop ovarian cancer? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 16 THE WITNESS: No. That's not what 17 I'm -- 18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Subject to 19 any questions Michelle has, I have no more 20 questions at this time. 21 I do just want to before I turn 22 this over to Michelle, as I said earlier, 23 I'm not feeling well; and I did get very 24 frustrated this morning. I did not think 25 my outburst was particularly professional.	Page 207	1 questions? 2 A. Yes, I do. 3 Q. Okay. Let me show you what's been 4 entitled, "Environmental Protection Agency." 5 It's 40 CFR, Part 751. 6 And specifically, I'd like you to 7 turn to page 14 of that document. Here you go, 8 Doctor. 9 A. Thank you. 10 Q. And if you'll turn to page 14. 11 MS. DAVIDSON: Can we put that up 12 on the screen as well? 13 MS. PARFITT: Okay. 14 MS. DAVIDSON: And should we mark 15 it as an exhibit? 16 MS. PARFITT: Sure. We certainly 17 can. We'll mark it as plaintiff's Exhibit 18 Number 1. 19 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit P1, 20 Pre-Publication Notice, was marked for 21 identification.) 22 MS. PARFITT: And, Patrick, if you 23 have a copy of the -- perfect. Thank you, 24 Patrick. And that will be marked as 25 plaintiff's Exhibit Number 1.	Page 209

53 (Pages 206 - 209)

<p>1 And page 14, Patrick. Can you 2 share with us page 14? 3 Thank you so much.</p> <p>4 BY MS. PARFITT:</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And, Dr. Siemiatycki, at the 6 bottom of page 14, specifically, the document 7 says, "Additionally, some talc deposits and 8 articles containing talc have been shown to 9 contain asbestos. Thus, EPA recognizes that 10 certain uses of talc may present the potential 11 for asbestos exposure."</p> <p>12 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. All right. What is the 15 significance of that statement concerning the 16 fact that talc deposits and articles containing 17 talc have been shown to contain asbestos?</p> <p>18 What significance does that 19 statement have to your opinions with regard to 20 the relationship of asbestos to the biological 21 plausibility that talc can cause ovarian 22 cancer?</p> <p>23 A. Well, my main take away from this 24 is that if the epidemiological evidence 25 demonstrates an association between women's use</p>	<p>Page 210</p> <p>1 statistical analyses; and the credibility of 2 that meta-analysis is persuasive to me. 3 I've also seen a recent report -- I 4 can't remember now -- from a Korean group that 5 updated the Camargo analysis because the 6 Camargo analysis only included papers published 7 until about 2010 or 2011; and the new paper, 8 relatively new paper publishes additional 9 papers. And it goes in exactly the same 10 direction. It reinforces the same conclusion.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you also review the IARC 12 monograph 2012?</p> <p>13 A. Well, I didn't need to review it 14 because I was on the panel.</p> <p>15 Q. Does the IARC monograph 2012, does 16 it address talcum powder as a cause of 17 ovarian -- or talc as a cause of ovarian 18 cancer?</p> <p>19 A. There is a mention of talc because, 20 although this particular IARC monograph meeting 21 did not include talc as one of the primary 22 exposures to be reevaluated, it did include 23 asbestos.</p> <p>24 And as part of the asbestos 25 evaluation, there was an evaluation of talc</p>
<p>1 of talc and ovarian cancer, this information 2 provides some potential avenues for biological 3 plausibility that the asbestos might be 4 responsible for excess risks for 5 epidemiologically demonstrated excess risks of 6 ovarian cancer.</p> <p>7 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, some time ago you 8 were also asked whether or not you had done a 9 systematic review of the literature regarding 10 asbestos and ovarian cancer.</p> <p>11 Do you remember those questions?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. All right. Does the fact that you 14 did not do a complete systematic review of 15 asbestos prevent you from opining on a 16 relationship of asbestos to be biological 17 plausibility of talcum powder causing ovarian 18 cancer?</p> <p>19 A. Not at all.</p> <p>20 Q. Why not?</p> <p>21 A. Well, there have been now a couple 22 of reviews of the topic. One, the main one by 23 Camargo and colleagues, was carried out by very 24 a competent team. They describe their methods 25 of searching for data of carrying out the</p>	<p>Page 211</p> <p>1 containing asbestos form fibers. And so there 2 was an evaluation, which concluded that talc 3 containing asbestos form fibers was carcinogenic.</p> <p>4 Q. You were asked questions about 5 reaching out to SGO, ACOG, the NCI PDQ, and 6 other medical and scientific organizations.</p> <p>7 Do you remember that series of 8 questions?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>10 Q. Why haven't you, as an 11 epidemiologist, reached out to speak to SGO and 12 ACOG and -- excuse me, the PDQ?</p> <p>13 A. Well, that's not the way scientific 14 communication works. I never in my career 15 reached out to organizations like that to give 16 them my opinions or to tell them about my 17 results because they don't really have the 18 capacity to intake opinions and information 19 from every researcher who studies all of the 20 topics in their purview. So it's just not 21 done. I've never heard of researchers doing 22 things like that.</p> <p>23 The normal and natural and 24 efficient way is to communicate through 25 scientific publications and scientific</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 meetings. And information, once it -- which it 2 gets into such forums, then gets assimilated 3 into the general medical research community and 4 it ends up influencing those organizations if 5 they have responsibility for communicating 6 information like this to the public.</p> <p>7 But in my experience -- and I've 8 been president of Association of 9 Epidemiologists. I was on the board of the 10 American College of Epidemiology. And these 11 organizations are not equipped to -- to carry 12 out evaluations of all possible research topics 13 and to communicate all of the possible research 14 issues to the public.</p> <p>15 Q. Do scientists like yourself in the 16 epidemiologic community rely on groups like the 17 NCI PDQ and other -- SGO, ACOG, and others for 18 scientific literature as part of their bases 19 for their opinions?</p> <p>20 A. No. I've -- I have never seen any 21 of those organizations or NCI PDQ cited as a 22 reference in a scientific journal. I've never 23 heard scientists communicate that some 24 important result is reported in such media as 25 NCI PDQ or some of the websites of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 specifically at column of questions Numbers 1 2 through 4 and 7 -- and I'll show it to you, and 3 specifically, I'm referencing Number 5 and 6. 4 And in that you stated, "From 2016 5 to 2020 January, I provided, A) consultation 6 services to law firms that were involved in 7 litigation against companies that produced or 8 sold talcum powder products."</p> <p>9 Do you remember that series of 10 questions?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And you represented to 13 counsel that you were incorrect with regard to 14 that -- those dates. All right.</p> <p>15 How did you prepare this document, 16 and what documents did you rely on for purposes 17 of that statement?</p> <p>18 A. I didn't rely on any documents. I 19 did it by memory, and I did it hastily because 20 I didn't think it was important document any of 21 this.</p> <p>22 I understand how the IARC system 23 works, having been part of it for a period of 24 time. And I -- I sort of wrote things down 25 hastily without carrying out any verifications</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 organizations like this. It's just not part of 2 the infrastructure of knowledge transmission 3 within the scientific community.</p> <p>4 Q. I can't recall the precise 5 question, Dr. Siemiatycki, but you were asked 6 specifically whether or not you agreed or 7 disagreed with the American Cancer Society.</p> <p>8 If, in fact, it was the 9 representation the American Cancer Society that 10 talcum powder was not associated with ovarian 11 cancer and/or there was insufficient evidence 12 to support that talcum powder could cause 13 ovarian cancer or associated with ovarian 14 cancer, would you agree or disagree with that?</p> <p>15 A. I would disagree with that.</p> <p>16 Q. Doctor, you were asked several 17 questions with regard to a declaration of 18 interest that you filed with IARC as well as a 19 letter that you sent to IARC anticipating their 20 re-review of the talcum powder in 2024.</p> <p>21 Do you remember those questions?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you remember counsel 24 addressing I believe it's Exhibit 3, 2 or 3, 25 the actual Declaration of Interest,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 of the dates. I didn't think the dates were 2 important. I put them in here. I'm not sure 3 why, but at that -- when I did this in the 4 summer of 2023, I was recollecting when these 5 things happened; and I got it wrong.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you have an understanding that 7 this litigation was in bankruptcy for a period 8 of time?</p> <p>9 A. I -- I heard about that.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. What was the nature of your 11 work in this case during the period of 12 bankruptcy, if any?</p> <p>13 A. I didn't do any during that period.</p> <p>14 Q. Is it fair to say that there was a 15 period of a few years where you did no work at 16 all because the case was being stayed in 17 bankruptcy?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, that's true.</p> <p>19 Q. You were asked about the Goodman 20 article, and specifically the Goodman article 21 that's entitled, "A critical review of talc and 22 ovarian cancer."</p> <p>23 Do you remember that question? Do 24 you remember that question?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I do.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 218</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And specifically, you 2 addressed the Goodman article in your report? 3 A. Yes, I do. 4 Q. All right. Would you turn to your 5 report. I believe it's page 76. 6 Tell me when you're ready. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. What, if any, methodological flaws 9 did you observe based upon your review and 10 analysis of the Goodman study entitled, "A 11 critical review of talc and ovarian cancer"? 12 A. Well, I found it methodologically 13 quite flawed, and I didn't take the resulting 14 opinions that they gave very seriously. I 15 could list some of the problems that -- that I 16 pointed out. 17 Q. What were they? 18 A. First, it's curious that they did 19 not conduct a meta-analysis to estimate the 20 relative risk from the unsong of epidemiologic 21 studies that they considered of good quality. 22 That would be a natural thing to do if they 23 had -- they had all the material they needed. 24 Instead, they rely on a fatally 25 flawed method of using statistical significance</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 220</p> <p>1 done that, and you produce a meta-analysis; and 2 they -- you don't produce a meta-analysis. You 3 produce a count of how many studies are 4 individually significant or nonsignificance, 5 and you find that most are them or all of them 6 are not significant. 7 Well, that is a hopeless distortion 8 of what statistical significance is about. But 9 this is what they did in this -- in this paper. 10 Q. In this Goodman paper? 11 A. In this Goodman paper. 12 Q. Any other? 13 A. They make basic error of asserting 14 that cohort studies across the board are 15 superior in validity to case control studies. 16 This is completely false. There is 17 no credible epidemiological literature that 18 demonstrates or proves such a proposition. 19 Each study has strengths and weaknesses, and it 20 requires sophistication to tally up the 21 strengths and weaknesses of each study and to 22 find what the results mean. Whether it's a 23 case control or a cohort study is not a 24 determinant of the quality of and the validity 25 of the results.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 219</p> <p>1 of individual studies and tallying up how many 2 studies are individually statistically 3 significant to guide their overall conclusion. 4 Q. And what did you mean by that? 5 A. Well, in the old days, people used 6 to do that. People used to count up -- do a 7 literature review and count how many studies 8 show a statistically significant association 9 with something and how many don't and use that 10 as a kind of an indicator of whether there's an 11 overall trend that shows an association. 12 And it was painfully clear to 13 sophisticated statisticians and other 14 researchers, clinical as well as 15 epidemiological, that it's hopelessly flawed to 16 count statistical significance studies as a 17 measure of anything. Statistical significance 18 does not -- is not something that can be 19 counted up between -- among studies. 20 The best way to guarantee that 21 you'll never find an association is to conduct 22 studies with small numbers -- small enough 23 numbers of subjects that none of the results 24 will be statistically significant. And then 25 you gather together all the studies that have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p> <p>1 The third problem with the Goodman 2 study -- well, they -- they present a bunch of 3 studies in their list, but some of them are 4 actually subsumed in other -- some of the 5 papers are subsumed in other studies, which 6 were follow-ups and analyses done later. And 7 this is not how to -- how to do a review of a 8 topic. It's sort of a double-counting problem. 9 And the next problem was their 10 interpretation of the conformity of the results 11 with Bradford Hill's considerations. It's 12 their interpretation and their evaluation, 13 their description of how the Bradford Hill 14 considerations apply to the literature. The 15 studies that they have considered is very 16 subjective, and it's unreliable. It's not 17 objective and fact-based. 18 Well, and the next point -- my last 19 point was while the they point out many gaps in 20 knowledge regarding the transport of fibers and 21 the mechanisms of carcinogenesis, they tend to 22 interpret the absence of evidence as evidence 23 against an association. So -- 24 Q. And what does that mean? 25 A. Well, when -- you know, there are</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 some areas where there just hasn't been 2 definitive research to demonstrate that certain 3 mechanisms of translocation of -- transport of 4 fibers in the body would support the hypothesis 5 of talc fibers causing ovarian cancer.</p> <p>6 It's -- it's fine to present data 7 and make an argument that there are gaps in 8 knowledge. But their conclusion from the gaps 9 of knowledge is that this is evidence against 10 the hypothesis that the particles can be 11 transported to the ovaries, and that's a 12 logical flaw.</p> <p>13 Q. Any others that you wish to 14 express?</p> <p>15 A. No others that I would express now.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Jumping around, let me 17 direct your attention to the -- you can hold on 18 to the report -- direct your attention to the 19 Wentzensen and O'Brien article entitled, "Talc 20 body powder and ovarian cancer: A summary of 21 an epidemiological test."</p> <p>22 Do you have that?</p> <p>23 A. I have that.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Specifically, if you would 25 turn to the conclusions section, which is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 performed and documented in now several 2 reports?</p> <p>3 A. I think the associations is of 4 moderate magnitude compared to other cancer 5 risk factors if you look -- or disease risk 6 factors. And there are well-established cancer 7 risk factors that have relative risks well in 8 the range of 1.3, which is what we're talking 9 about for talc and ovarian cancer or even much 10 lower. Even for ovarian cancer there are 11 well-established risk factors that have -- that 12 have relative risks in the order of 1.3.</p> <p>13 So that is certainly not -- you 14 know, these terms "weak, strong, moderate" are 15 not scientifically designed. There's no 16 convention about what constitutes strong 17 evidence or weak evidence.</p> <p>18 The -- the original development of 19 risk factor -- modern risk factor epidemiology 20 occurred in the 1950s around the issue of 21 tobacco and lung cancer, and it so happened 22 that the relative risk of that association was 23 about 10 or 15. And that became kind of a 24 marker for relative risks between risk factors 25 and disease.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 Section 6. And it spans to the front of 2 page 9 -- the top of page 9.</p> <p>3 Are you there?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>5 Q. The sentence starts, "Independent 6 of the underlying cause" --</p> <p>7 A. I have it.</p> <p>8 Q. "Independent of the underlying 9 cause, the association between powder use and 10 ovarian cancer is weak. The low relative risk 11 translates to a very low risk increase given 12 the rarity of ovarian cancer."</p> <p>13 Do you remember that question being 14 asked of you?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And do you agree or disagree 17 with that statement?</p> <p>18 A. With the statement that the 19 evidence is weak?</p> <p>20 Q. Correct.</p> <p>21 A. No, I don't agree with that.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. How would you describe the 23 evidence in the talcum powder and ovarian 24 cancer based upon the literature review -- 25 systematic literature review that you have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 We -- people didn't know at the 2 time that hardly any chance of risk factor 3 would ever be shown to have such strong and 4 high relative risk. So having that as the 5 first thing that the discipline discovered and 6 latched on to and started developing 7 terminology around and conventions around in a 8 way distorted how subsequent epidemiology of 9 other risk factors was described in the 10 literature and described even in public.</p> <p>11 But certainly there is -- there are 12 many examples now of risk factors which are in 13 the same range as the talc ovarian cancer 14 relative risk, which are considered strongly 15 supported evidence in epidemiology.</p> <p>16 Q. You have stated in your report that 17 the evidence in the talcum powder and ovarian 18 cancer case, based upon your systematic review, 19 is significant.</p> <p>20 When said "the evidence regarding 21 consistency and strength is significant," what 22 do you mean by that?</p> <p>23 A. I'm not sure. If you could point 24 me to a page.</p> <p>25 That the evidence is significant?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 Q. Generally, the strength of the 2 evidence and the association of the evidence is 3 significant.</p> <p>4 A. Well, I don't remember using that 5 word in that context. But, you know, I'd say 6 the evidence is persuasive and persuasive 7 because of some of the concepts that we 8 associate with the Bradford Hill 9 considerations; but it's not because it's 10 Bradford Hill, but the strength, the magnitude 11 and the -- especially the consistency of the 12 results from different studies carried out in 13 different countries of different populations of 14 women by different teams of investigators and 15 over a 30-year span by -- published over a 30- 16 or 40-year span; and almost all of them 17 indicate that there is an excess risk.</p> <p>18 Whether the individual studies are 19 statistically significant at point .05 level or 20 not is moot. It's not the important thing. 21 But putting all of that together and carrying 22 out appropriate meta-analyses shows that there 23 is incontrovertible evidence that there is a 24 strong association.</p> <p>25 Going to causality requires a few</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 description -- 2 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 3 Q. That describe an association 4 between 1.1 and 1.3 as "strong." 5 MS. PARFITT: You're referring to 6 talc articles or anything? 7 MS. DAVIDSON: I think my question 8 stands for itself, Michelle.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Well, I assume that 10 your question refers to anything, not just 11 talc.</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Have you ever read a publication 14 that described an association between 1.1 and 15 1.3 as, quote, "strong"?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I can't really recall 18 because, you know, that's not how I 19 process and categorize information about 20 associations.</p> <p>21 But in my report there are 22 several -- there are some examples of 23 associations that have such relative risks 24 that are well accepted as being causal and 25 there are many more.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 more hoops to demonstrate.</p> <p>2 Q. And you have done that in your 3 report, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: All right. Give 6 me -- Jessica, if you will give me about 7 30 seconds just to make sure -- we can go 8 off real quick to see if I have any 9 further questions, and I think we'll be 10 good.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Sure.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Thank you.</p> <p>13 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Thank you. I have no 15 further questions at this time.</p> <p>16 EXAMINATION</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. I just have a few, Dr. Siemiatycki.</p> <p>19 Can you point me to any publication 20 that refers to an association between 1.1 and 21 1.3 as, quote, "strong"?</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Are you 24 asking me to point to publications that 25 report such associations or that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 But having the authors or somebody 2 using the word "strong," I don't recall. 3 It would require me to have an incredible 4 memory to remember every paper I've ever 5 heard about, you know, cardiovascular 6 disease and hyperlipidemia; and, you know, 7 I just can't recall every single paper 8 I've ever seen and which words they used 9 to categorize an association.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Would it surprise you to know that 12 I have looked high and low and have never been 13 able to find a published epidemiological paper 14 that uses the word "strong" to describe an 15 association in the one to two -- between in the 16 1 to 2 -- with one- to two-point estimates?</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Would it surprise me?</p> <p>19 No, it wouldn't surprise me.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Wait, wait.</p> <p>23 Do you have anymore.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I would start 25 probably by finding a little bit more</p>

1 about how you did your search; but even if 2 your search was conducted in the most 3 thorough and rigorous way, it wouldn't 4 surprise me. 5 As I indicated, I don't recall 6 every paper I've read and whether which 7 descriptors people use. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. Can we go back to Plaintiff's 10 Exhibit 1? 11 MS. PARFITT: To help us out with 12 one. 13 MS. DAVIDSON: Plaintiff's Exhibit 14 1. I believe it was page 14. 15 MS. PARFITT: Yeah. 16 MS. DAVIDSON: Maybe Patrick could 17 put it up since he put it up last time. 18 Is Patrick still here? 19 There he is. Thank you, Patrick. 20 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 21 Q. Ms. Parfitt read to you from 22 page 14, and at the bottom of page 14, I 23 believe it was. 24 A. Yeah. 25 Q. It says, "Some talc deposits in	Page 232 1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. It has 2 been covered in the first deposition. 3 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, you asked 4 about it in your redirect? 5 MS. PARFITT: That is -- that is 6 fair. 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. Are you offering such an opinion, 9 Doctor? 10 A. Well, I'm hesitating because I 11 don't know how much to say about this. In my 12 report -- 13 Q. It's a yes-or-no question. 14 MS. PARFITT: Wait. Let him 15 finish. He said in his report. 16 THE WITNESS: I'm happy to give a 17 yes-or-no answer, but what is the 18 question? 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. Are you planning to testify at 21 trial that you know the way by which talc 22 allegedly causes ovarian cancer? 23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 24 THE WITNESS: Do I know the way 25 it -- the way talc causes ovarian cancer
Page 231 1 articles containing talc have been shown to 2 contain asbestos." 3 Do you see that? 4 A. I see that. 5 Q. Does the paper specify what 6 deposits? 7 A. I haven't read the rest of this 8 paper, so I don't know if the -- anything in 9 the paper -- this sentence doesn't specify. I 10 don't know if there's anything else in the 11 paper that would specify. 12 Q. Does this sentence specify whether 13 they're talking about industrial talc versus 14 cosmetic talc? 15 A. This sentence does not specify. 16 Q. And you have no idea whether the 17 deposits and products they're talking about 18 are -- have anything to do with Johnson's Baby 19 Powder, correct? 20 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 21 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. Do you have an opinion on the 24 biological pathway by which talc causes ovarian 25 cancer allegedly?	Page 233 1 is that the question? 2 Do I know the way. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. Do you plan to testify at trial as 5 to how you believe talc allegedly causes 6 ovarian cancer, how, the mechanism, the 7 biological pathway? 8 A. No, I don't -- I don't plan to 9 testify -- 10 Q. Okay. 11 A. -- that I know the way. 12 Q. You testified earlier that you 13 don't typically speak to public health groups. 14 You did, however, speak to Health 15 Canada, correct? 16 A. I spoke to a Health Canada 17 scientist. 18 Q. Who is what the scientist? 19 A. What is his name? Hancock. 20 Q. Did you research his credentials? 21 MS. PARFITT: Objection to the 22 extent -- 23 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't -- 24 MS. PARFITT: -- it was covered in 25 his '21 report.

1 THE WITNESS: -- research his 2 credentials. 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 4 Q. You said no? 5 A. I didn't research his credentials. 6 Q. Did you research the credentials of 7 any of the authors of the Health Canada paper? 8 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 9 answered and covered in the '21 10 deposition. 11 THE WITNESS: No. 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. Are you aware that another 14 plaintiff's expert has reached out multiple 15 times to ACOG and SGO? 16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 17 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not aware. 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Have plaintiffs shared with you -- 20 plaintiff's counsel shared with you the 21 discovery that they sought from ACOG and SGO 22 about their communications with a plaintiff's 23 expert? 24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 25 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I didn't -- I	Page 234 1 colleague with a student a study of lung cancer 2 risks among women who resided in the towns of 3 Quebec where asbestos had been mined and milled 4 in order to get an idea of whether 5 environmental exposure to asbestos dust caused 6 an increase in lung cancer risk. 7 Q. I take it none of those papers 8 related to ovarian cancer? 9 A. No. 10 Q. Have you ever published anything in 11 the peer-reviewed literature about asbestos and 12 ovarian cancer? 13 A. No. 14 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 15 Asked and answered in the '21 deposition. 16 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 17 Q. Did you ever consider a potential 18 association between asbestos and ovarian cancer 19 before you were hired as an expert in this 20 litigation? 21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, I -- because I 23 was invited to participate in an IARC 24 expert panel that evaluated talc among 25 some other substances in 2006. And as a
1 didn't quite understand the question. 2 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 3 Q. Are you aware that plaintiff's 4 counsel have subpoenaed SGO and ACOG for 5 documents related to talc? 6 A. No. 7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 8 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 9 Q. Did they share those documents with 10 you? 11 A. No. 12 Q. Have you ever published any paper 13 in the peer-reviewed literature about asbestos? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. What was that paper? 16 A. I think there were a few that I was 17 on. I -- I was involved as a research 18 assistant when I started out in a team that was 19 studying cancer risks among asbestos miners and 20 millers in Quebec, and I was included in as a 21 coauthor on a couple of publications that came 22 out of that. It concerned mill workers and 23 occupational exposure and lung cancer and 24 mesothelioma as the possible outcomes. 25 I also carried out or with a	Page 235 1 member -- in fact, as the chairman of that 2 review committee, I had occasion to become 3 familiar with talc and ovarian cancer 4 epidemiology. 5 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go off the 6 record for a minute. 7 (Discussion held off the record.) 8 (Whereupon, a break was taken.) 9 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 10 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, you testified in 11 this litigation in 2019 that the cell phone and 12 brain cancer literature is not affected by 13 recall bias. 14 Is that still your position? 15 THE WITNESS: Sorry? 16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 17 THE WITNESS: Which literature? 18 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 19 Q. Cell phones and brain cancer. 20 A. Cell phones and brain cancer? 21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. You testified in 2019 that it's not 24 affected by recall bias, that literature. I'm 25 wondering if that's still your position today.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 238</p> <p>1 A. Sorry. I'm trying to resituate my 2 thoughts. 3 So this is in a deposition about 4 talc, right, and ovarian cancer, not in a -- 5 not in any litigation around cell phones; is 6 that correct? 7 Q. Were you ever in litigation around 8 cell phones? 9 A. No. 10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 11 THE WITNESS: No. That's why -- 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. You couldn't have testified to it, 14 right? 15 A. I don't -- at first glance, I 16 couldn't understand why I would be testifying 17 about cell phones and brain cancer in talc. 18 Okay. So can you restate the 19 question? 20 Q. What needs to be restated? 21 A. In a -- so in a deposition in -- 22 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, let me make it 23 simpler for you. 24 Do you believe that the cell phone 25 cancer literature is affected by recall bias?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 240</p> <p>1 Q. I'm fine. 2 A. Do -- are you alleging that in 3 2019 -- 4 Q. I'm not alleging anything, Doctor. 5 I'm asking a question. "Alleging" I don't 6 think is a fair word. 7 A. Is the premise of your question 8 that in 2019 I stated that I believe that there 9 is recall bias in studies of cell phones and 10 brain cancer or there is not recall bias in 11 those studies? 12 What are you saying that I said at 13 the time? 14 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, I just want to 15 know whether you currently believe that the 16 cell phone brain cancer literature is affected 17 by recall bias? 18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 19 THE WITNESS: I think it is 20 potentially affected by it, but I'm not 21 confirming or denying anything that you 22 say I said or that you're implying that I 23 said in 2019. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. Do you agree that recall bias</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 239</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 2 THE WITNESS: I have to think about 3 that because -- for a minute because any 4 evaluation of recall bias is 5 context-specific. And so I'm trying to 6 resituate myself in the context of the 7 evidence around cell phones and brain 8 cancer. 9 And so I think there's a 10 possibility that it could be affected by 11 recall bias, yes. 12 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 13 Q. So your opinion on that has changed 14 since 2019, correct? 15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. If 16 you can direct us to his prior opinion and 17 testimony, that would be helpful. Right 18 now it's a guess. 19 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 20 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki? 21 A. No. I don't understand -- 22 understand the question because are you stating 23 or are you alleging that the in 2019 -- sorry. 24 Do you need to go off the record? 25 Are you okay?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 241</p> <p>1 should be assessed and evaluated when there's a 2 discrepancy between case control studies and 3 cohort studies on a specific exposure? 4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. The topic 5 of recall bias was exhaustively examined 6 in his 2021 deposition prior. 7 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 8 Q. Go ahead, Doctor. 9 MS. PARFITT: Move on. 10 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 11 Q. Go ahead, Doctor. 12 A. I think all sources of bias should 13 be considered when examining any possible 14 association. 15 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I have no 16 further questions. 17 MS. PARFITT: I just have one quick 18 one. 19 EXAMINATION 20 BY MS. PARFITT: 21 Q. Dr. Siemiatycki, you were asked 22 with regard to literature that you had 23 published on the topic of talc and ovarian 24 cancer. Do. 25 You remember question by counsel?</p>

1 MS. DAVIDSON: He was not. He was 2 not asked that. 3 THE WITNESS: Asbestos. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: I didn't ask that. 5 I asked about asbestos, Michelle. 6 MS. PARFITT: Oh, asbestos. 7 MS. DAVIDSON: I didn't ask about 8 talc. 9 MS. PARFITT: I have no further 10 questions. 11 MS. DAVIDSON: Great. Have a good 12 day everybody. 13 MS. PARFITT: Suzanne, we are going 14 to read and sign. Thank you. 15 MS. DAVIDSON: We just want 16 expedited, but not -- we just want 17 expedited, but not rough. We're looking 18 for expedites, but not roughs. 19 THE COURT REPORTER: That's fine. 20 When do you need that by. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Monday. 22 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank 23 you. 24 MS. PARFITT: We'll take one as 25 well. Thank you.	Page 242 1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 4 I, SUZANNE J. STOTZ, a Certified 5 Court Reporter, Registered Professional 6 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and 7 Notary Public in and for the State of New 8 Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is 9 a true and accurate transcript of the 10 stenographic above-captioned matter. 11 12  13 14 SUZANNE J. STOTZ, CCR, RPR, CRR 15 LICENSE NO. 30XI00184500 16 17 18 DATED: March 31, 2024 19 20 21 NOTE: THE CERTIFICATE APPENDED TO THIS 22 TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION 23 OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS, UNLESS UNDER THE 24 DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE 25 CERTIFYING COURT REPORTER.
1 THE COURT REPORTER: Expedited too 2 or regular delivery, Ms. Parfitt? 3 MS. PARFITT: When you deliver 4 hers, you can deliver mine. 5 (The witness is excused.) 6 (Deposition of Jack Siemiatycki, 7 MSC, Ph.D, concluded at 5:35 p.m. EDT.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Page 243 1 E R R A T A S H E E T 2 I have read my testimony in the foregoing 3 transcript and believe it to be true and 4 correct to the best of my knowledge and belief 5 with the following changes: 6 PAGE LINE CHANGE 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____ 11 _____ 12 _____ 13 _____ 14 _____ 15 _____ 16 _____ 17 _____ 18 _____ 19 WITNESS SIGNATURE DATE 20 21 Sworn and subscribed to before me this 22 _____ day of _____, 2024. 23 24 Notary Public of the 25 State of _____.

62 (Pages 242 - 245)

[& - 2011]

Page 1

& & 1:3 2:4,21 125:9 137:8 0 0.99 192:23 05 100:8 226:19 1 1 9:16 68:8,8,12 68:16 69:12,17 69:22,23 70:12 70:13 95:17 164:21 209:18 209:25 216:1 229:16 230:10 230:14 1.0. 9:17 1.01 192:21 193:9,13 203:16 1.05 158:5 184:18 1.05. 178:7 1.06 182:24 183:10 1.06. 179:14 1.07 181:21 182:5,25 183:11 1.1 159:9 227:20 228:4 228:14 1.13 203:15 1.13. 192:21	1.15 193:10,14 203:17 1.15. 192:24 1.2 159:9 1.22 99:9 1.26 193:9,13 203:16 1.26. 192:21 1.3 159:5 224:8 227:21 228:4 228:15 1.3. 224:12 1.32 99:10 1.37 181:20 182:4 1.39 66:11 1.4 159:7 1.47 58:16,19 59:24 60:1 66:12 1.5 159:7 1.58 114:25 117:21 118:21 1.58. 113:25 1.88 116:15 119:21,23 10 3:5 138:9 140:23 142:8 1.1 159:9 227:20 228:4 228:14 1.13 203:15 1.13. 192:21	11 161:8 11:14 1:14 12 168:8 12203 244:12 123 4:20 128 5:5 13 76:11 172:25 173:6 136 3:23 58:7 85:17 14 193:20,21 194:19,25 209:7,10 210:1 210:2,6 230:14 230:22,22 14.9 135:5 142 5:8 143 101:20 15 11:13 23:21 76:18 187:21 198:4,6,19 201:12 205:11 224:23 15th 9:7 16-2738 1:2 162 5:11 168 5:15 17 47:5 173 5:21 17th 52:1 18 34:20 1835 2:16 19001 2:23 106 4:13 108 4:15	1950s 224:20 1980s 136:21 137:6,16 1990 141:14 1992 135:5 2 2 9:15 76:22 78:18 80:3,17 81:16 82:15 112:12,16 113:5 160:23 199:17,21 200:5 215:24 229:16 2.20 114:25 117:21 118:22 121:11 2.20. 114:5 2.57 114:20 116:15 119:21 119:23 122:15 2.57. 116:18 121:23 122:17 20 23:22 73:18 134:18 138:9 140:23 200 22:1 63:16 104:2 200,000 21:20 22:17 2006 236:25 2008 34:22 2010 212:7 2011 212:7
---	--	--	--

[2012 - 8]

Page 2

2012	212:12,15	41:23 42:1,9	3	5.3. 151:9
2015	23:8	47:5 52:1,15	3	50 26:1,3,5
2016	23:9 83:17 87:6,15 216:4	83:1 84:10 88:11,25 89:9	98:3,9 151:7 215:24,24	500 22:24
2017	34:19	101:12 124:9	30 118:6 134:18	54 199:14
2019	55:25 87:6 87:16 123:1 124:7 135:6	146:13 148:12 217:4	136:2,5 138:21 226:15,15 227:7	202:14,16 203:8
		2024 1:13 171:1		5:35 243:7
				6
2020	37:5 83:17 84:12 88:25 128:25 141:14 146:12 148:12 192:3 193:18 216:5	171:9 215:20 244:18 245:22 204 6:9 208 3:6 209 6:13 21 11:16 15:18 18:23 30:19 101:5 233:25 234:9 236:15	300 22:24 30th 11:16 30xi00184500 1:12 244:15 31 244:18 316 2:11 31st 49:16 32502 2:12	6 67:13 96:12 96:14 106:10 111:2 145:14 146:2,4 216:3 223:1
2021	9:20 24:4 27:7,9 29:8 30:6,14 32:21 32:25 36:25 37:4,23 42:10 43:1 61:4,5 84:18,20,23 89:2,5,7 90:15 90:16 93:18 94:5 95:7 97:18 101:11,21 124:8,17 129:7 129:10 145:19 184:5 185:8,18 188:24 241:6	212 2:24 215 2:17 22 142:5 22311 2:6 227 3:7 23 11:13 15:23 18:2,23 42:6 51:23 241 3:8 21:22 241,000 19:25 20:8 22:16 25 76:11,18 138:10 140:24 27 1:13 278-4449 2:17	4 91:1,23 94:6 146:24 147:1 216:2 4.2 147:3 40 9:8,13 209:5 226:16 400 22:5,24 23:15 400,000 21:21 435-7000 2:12 47 58:25 59:14 60:5 4900 2:6	7 108:8 151:4 216:2 70 3:14 70s 54:9 73 178:3 735-3000 2:24 75 26:10 751 209:5 76 145:23 150:11,12 218:5 78 142:3
2022	108:4,8,19 141:25	28th 83:1 2900 2:16	5	8 65:24 105:19 122:25 155:15 155:17 192:10 193:3
2023	9:7,23 17:19 18:2			

[8.1.2 - african]

Page 3

8.1.2 9:8	absolute 59:13 61:22 62:13	acronym 38:14 39:10	93:4 105:23,25 106:2,19 129:3
80s 54:9	absolutely 12:22	acronyms 38:8	129:6 163:11 212:16
82 3:20	abstract 172:9 175:2 187:22	acrylonitrile 3:23 85:17	addressed 54:10 218:2
844 2:7	abstracts 172:11	active 131:7	addresses 93:11
85 3:22	accept 44:7	actual 74:14 115:9 117:18 117:19 132:8	addressing 50:9 139:7 215:24
850 2:12	accepted 36:1 140:22 228:24	140:10 215:25	adjunct 29:17 29:18,23
86 192:24 193:10,14 203:17	accompanying 57:19	actually 38:14 47:15 51:24	adjusted 174:19 176:23
9	account 191:22	57:20 60:7	177:9 179:9,13
9 34:22 127:22 160:12 223:2,2	accumulation 43:21	64:10 65:12,17	179:23,23
9.6 135:5	accuracy 194:11	81:16 141:4	180:3 181:10
91 4:5	accurate 78:22 83:23 84:4,7	144:5 153:23	182:23 183:8
95 4:8 117:25 121:18,22 122:14 179:24 180:5 181:16 184:21	88:6 89:25 90:3	155:25 157:7	183:10
960 108:23	90:10,22 93:9	172:7 178:6	administration 17:15
97 116:18 122:17	122:3 244:9	189:6 190:17	admitted 57:9
99 203:17	accurately 164:14 165:4 183:16	191:17 197:10	adopted 129:13
a	acknowledge 29:14	203:13 221:4	advance 16:20
a.f. 124:25	acknowledge... 110:9,12,25 111:2	add 101:3 107:14	affect 158:6 165:19 167:24
a.m. 1:14	acog 37:15	added 42:6,15 101:11 102:11	affected 138:20
aa 105:16	213:5,12	102:20 103:1	139:15 237:12
able 15:15 101:13 125:16 175:17 176:1 229:13	214:17 234:15	addition 18:19 22:16	237:24 238:25
above 1:10 151:7 244:10	234:21 235:4	additional 22:14 212:8	239:10 240:16
absence 221:22		additionally 210:7	240:20
		additions 41:25 42:2,4,7,9	affiliations 29:14
		address 49:10 66:2 92:25 93:2	affirm 137:2 138:6
			african 4:11 95:6,11 98:3,16

[african - apparent]

Page 4

98:19 99:2,9,20 99:24 age 76:2,7,12 177:9 179:23 agency 34:16 209:4 ages 76:11 ago 16:14 33:22 35:20 51:21 56:14,15 73:18 187:21 192:6 204:1 208:21 211:7 agree 41:7,9,11 48:20 72:3 73:1 74:10,13 125:7 135:25 164:17 165:7,9 215:14 223:16,21 240:25 agreed 215:6 ahead 71:13 101:15 152:9 169:20 208:9 241:8,11 air 158:6 al 3:19 4:7,12 4:19,24 5:7,10 5:14,20 6:8,12 70:19 80:24 91:5 95:13 108:13 123:9 127:24 128:6 142:13 162:5 168:18 194:5 204:19	alexandria 2:6 algebra 59:4 algebraic 62:2 allegedly 231:25 232:22 233:5 alleging 239:23 240:2,4,5 allen 125:2,4,11 allison 123:19 allow 70:3 allowed 127:7 127:13 alluding 188:20 alpha 100:17 alternatives 137:9 amazing 176:14 amenable 43:13,16 amended 4:13 106:12 145:24 american 40:11 40:14,23 98:3 98:16,19 99:2,9 99:20,24 132:23 133:4 214:10 215:7,9 amount 116:23 amounts 25:1 analogous 67:14 analyses 9:9 35:2 36:9 47:6 54:13 66:14	67:24 212:1 221:6 226:22 analysis 3:17 6:10 18:1 33:8 34:7 64:9,24 65:20,25 66:8 66:10,17,24 67:8,13,14 70:18 136:12 138:17,25 149:12,21 178:4,9,9 204:12,17 205:19 212:2,5 212:6 218:10 218:19 220:1,2 analyze 66:17 analyzed 34:21 analyzing 205:25 ancestry 4:11 95:6,12 anita 33:24 92:3 answer 14:24 25:3,17,21,21 28:10,12 31:12 41:1 46:19,20 56:1 61:25 69:2 71:17 74:3 75:15 77:18 102:16 104:7 117:9 141:20 152:8 178:19 181:7 183:2,3,5 183:14,15	186:2 196:17 199:23 200:22 203:7,10,10 232:17 answer's 80:15 answered 23:18 26:20 28:4 38:7 50:23 54:4 134:6 135:8 159:24 160:5 161:2 234:9 236:15 answering 45:24 46:5,11 68:21 74:8 102:8 141:5 answers 26:22 46:12 anticipate 87:25 88:7 anticipating 215:19 anybody 93:15 anymore 229:23 anyway 156:20 anyways 71:17 74:1 apologies 197:12 apologize 102:23,24 184:8 208:1 apparent 135:24
---	--	--	---

[apparently - assimilated]

Page 5

apparently	arithmetic	23:6	43:23 44:12,22	208:21 211:8
72:10	arps	2:21	47:3,9,18 48:11	213:4 215:5,16
appearing	article	3:14	49:3,11 50:21	217:19 223:14
97:20		17:23 18:7 19:1	53:8,19 54:10	232:3 234:8
appended		19:2 31:13	54:23 55:5	236:15 241:21
244:21		32:15 33:11	62:20 63:1	242:2,5
applicant		54:8 63:12,13	208:24 210:9	asking 16:5
57:20		69:14,25 70:7	210:11,17,20	21:2,6,9 24:25
application		70:15 72:18	211:3,10,15,16	27:16 28:22,24
34:16 57:14,16		76:24 94:24	212:23,24	38:17 57:20
apply		101:21 124:23	213:1 231:2	59:6,7,9,10
221:14		130:6 132:5,7	235:13,19	60:22 62:6
244:22		146:22 149:6	236:3,5,11,18	63:10 68:25
appreciate		150:9 155:3,5,7	242:3,5,6	74:1 75:12
10:4		160:7 162:22	ashcarft 110:21	76:16 77:12
105:5 107:9		163:9,11	111:16	78:2 90:9 93:23
123:4 208:4		165:14 170:22	ashcraft 2:4	99:1,11 102:15
appreciation		172:2,17,19	112:1	134:8 139:10
73:21 79:7		175:3 177:14	ashcraftlaw.c...	139:17 143:3
approach		178:14 190:25	2:7,8	148:20 160:20
88:10		191:2,20 205:4	asher 86:20	170:2 173:16
appropriate		217:20,20	89:12 104:25	182:10,11,16
138:19 226:22		218:2 222:19	105:1,1 174:11	185:19 187:8,9
approximated		articles 10:22	aside 171:25	191:23 195:15
81:10		10:24 12:9 33:5	asked 12:16	197:21 198:15
approximately		46:22 54:6	23:17 25:4	200:2,3,6,10
21:14 60:15		63:16 107:20	26:19 31:15	202:1 203:2
61:1 83:9		129:15 149:10	38:7 50:22 54:4	227:24 240:5
approximation		170:6 172:10	70:2,7 74:15	asserting
122:6		210:8,16 228:6	80:7 99:12	220:13
arbitrariness		231:1	102:8 117:8	assessed 241:1
64:23	asbestiform		134:5 135:7,16	assessment
area		213:3	159:23 160:4	70:21
6:7 47:21		asbestos 17:16	161:1 179:7	assimilated
49:15 113:24		17:25 32:20	188:13 190:15	214:2
194:3,13 195:1		43:3,10,14,20	203:2,21	
areas				
76:8				
222:1				
argument				
222:7				

[assistant - basis]

Page 6

assistant	assumption	157:6 159:19 160:2,12 164:4	baby 43:2 47:2 53:9 55:21
235:18	131:2	164:8,13	231:18
associate	assure 117:2	166:16 179:8	back 9:20,23
associated	attached 6:18	185:20 191:13	12:24 17:1,4
192:19 215:10	attempted	192:10 198:21	20:9 23:8 44:9
215:13	152:13	229:1 234:7	49:15,22 79:18
association	attempting	automated	101:5 106:16
3:14 6:6,11	183:3	71:10	107:15,17
40:16 41:13	attention	available 15:11	124:23 145:13
56:19 70:15	222:17,18	16:20 34:20	174:11 180:2
104:18 155:11	attenuate	149:22	184:4,24
155:22 156:23	205:21 206:1	avenues 211:2	192:15 197:7
157:7,19	attitude 129:14	average 76:2,7	202:13 230:9
158:15 160:14	attorneys 2:3	76:12 111:24	background
188:3,6 191:8	2:20	112:3 125:8,15	132:8
192:22 194:2	audio 77:1	aware 40:4,8	balderrama
194:12,25	author 17:24	40:14,20 50:19	206:24
204:13,18	51:8 63:22 64:6	50:24 58:16	ballpark 37:5
210:25 214:8	91:25 92:3 95:6	60:11 63:5,8,25	ban 17:15
219:8,11,21	108:18 113:15	64:1,3,8,14	54:23
221:23 223:9	113:18 128:1,2	81:19 125:24	bankruptcy
224:22 226:2	128:2 161:10	129:9,11	217:7,12,17
226:24 227:20	161:17 166:25	133:11,17	banning 208:23
228:3,14 229:9	168:12 204:13	134:16,19	based 40:18
229:15 236:18	authored 30:4	135:3,9 144:4	43:18 44:4,6
241:14	authoritative	144:18,21,24	132:7 149:5,9
associations	44:6	145:9 187:2	178:13,16,17
157:20 158:3	authors 35:5	206:15,19	218:9 221:17
173:19 224:3	36:6 63:6,8,14	234:13,17	223:24 225:18
227:25 228:20	63:17,18 64:17	235:3	bases 214:18
228:23	65:2,12 69:12	b	basic 220:13
assume 20:6	71:23 77:5 78:3	b 3:11 4:3 5:3	basically 55:9
100:9,18	97:6 109:7	6:3	66:16 73:11
186:24 193:3	123:18 143:24		basis 131:1,14
196:12 228:9	150:4 153:13		137:4
	155:20 156:20		

[bath - camera]

Page 7

bath 176:24 177:7 179:8,10 180:3 182:12 182:24 183:9 183:20 baylen 2:11 bearings 8:11 beasley 125:2,4 125:10 beast 134:8 began 33:22 beginning 52:13 198:11 begun 33:19,21 behalf 7:2 27:14 93:22 97:12,20 206:16 belief 19:4 245:4 beliefs 131:8 believe 16:13 68:12 71:5,19 110:11 113:13 129:1 135:21 136:16,17 137:7 166:6 169:22 199:6,6 199:7 205:11 206:7 215:24 218:5 230:14 230:23 233:5 238:24 240:8 240:15 245:3 believed 84:10 93:18 153:14	bell 38:10 52:8 bellwether 206:17 berg 143:17 144:4,9 best 121:11 219:20 245:4 better 71:10 bias 6:10 164:5 164:15 165:4 165:11,19 167:1 168:1 204:12,17 205:20 237:13 237:24 238:25 239:4,11 240:9 240:10,17,25 241:5,12 biases 167:24 bibliography 10:20 15:17 biden 17:15 big 96:19 bigger 86:1,18 binder 19:19 170:7 binders 10:19 10:22,25 104:3 170:5 biological 210:20 211:2 211:16 231:24 233:7 biomarkers 125:9	biomedicine 157:20 bit 15:4 22:2 54:16 65:3 72:7 74:4 86:9 91:17 131:6 229:25 blank 124:3 blanket 147:23 blockage 154:12 blocked 151:17 154:8 blount 47:13 53:25 54:6 blow 111:7 156:13,15 174:4 blue 11:14 board 214:9 220:14 body 190:22 222:4,20 bold 155:6 bottom 9:13 66:8,19 77:8 83:15 89:20 95:16 105:12 113:24 174:16 174:18 176:22 210:6 230:22 box 18:23,23 137:13 bradford 221:11,13 226:8,10	brain 38:9 237:12,19,20 238:17 239:7 240:10,16 break 53:1,3 82:13 127:20 206:13 227:13 237:8 breast 173:22 bring 10:17 broaden 140:25 brought 10:19 bulk 25:13 bullshit 101:25 bunch 221:2 buried 201:20
c			c 2:1 8:23,23 168:20,22 244:1,1 call 37:2 49:23 52:25 56:15 157:15 198:10 called 17:14,20 17:23,25 30:9 30:10 37:15 60:12 137:11 140:19 141:25 147:3 161:14 172:4 calling 105:1 camargo 211:23 212:5,6 camera 7:17,21 111:6 128:11

[camera - cause]

Page 8

128:18 202:20	142:12,21	cancer's 138:12	carry 152:10
202:21 205:17	143:16 149:23	cancers 5:18	157:12 214:11
campus 29:16	150:6,16,23	133:14 168:10	carrying
canada 8:5,8,9	151:11 152:6	168:16	211:25 216:25
27:15 37:2,6	153:8 155:2,12	capacity 27:25	226:21
38:1,15 233:15	155:23 156:24	28:25 213:18	case 21:1 27:8
233:16 234:7	157:22,25	captioned	27:12,13 28:3
canadian 27:8	158:3,7 159:6	244:10	33:9,16 64:13
cancer 3:16 4:7	159:21 160:15	captured	65:8 67:11 73:3
4:10,10,17,22	165:25 166:18	117:25	73:14 87:9 92:5
5:7,9 6:7,11	170:15 173:22	captures	92:7,9 117:2
9:11 17:7 18:1	173:25 174:20	151:22	146:14 147:7
27:15 30:5	176:17 177:10	capturing	147:25 148:6
32:25 33:6,17	178:2 179:10	121:16	148:10 149:7
36:24 37:9,20	188:5 190:23	carcinogeneses	156:21 188:1
39:2,17,23 40:2	192:20 194:4	221:21	217:11,16
40:6,12,15,17	195:2 197:24	carcinogenic	220:15,23
40:24 41:13	204:13,18	213:3	225:18 241:2
58:21,25 59:1	205:22 207:10	carcinogenicity	cases 20:17
59:12,14 60:1,5	207:14 210:22	32:10	21:24 29:5 69:7
60:13,25 61:22	211:1,6,10,18	cardiovascular	87:7 99:4,6,7
62:17,21 63:1	212:18 215:7,9	229:5	99:20 135:4
70:17 91:4,24	215:11,13,14	care 5:16 168:9	207:3,6
93:3 94:22 95:5	217:22 218:11	168:15 173:21	catch 164:18
95:5,10,11 97:6	222:5,20	199:22,24	categorize
104:17 105:15	223:10,12,24	200:9	228:19 229:9
108:11,17	224:4,6,9,10,21	career 131:25	category
113:22 114:3	225:13,18	213:14	173:20
123:7,16 125:9	231:25 232:22	carefully 73:8	causal 188:5
127:24 128:5	232:25 233:6	carl 206:24	228:24
132:1 133:9,18	235:19,23	carolina 126:8	causality
133:22 134:17	236:1,6,8,12,18	carried 33:10	226:25
135:4 136:2,6	237:3,12,19,20	33:23 36:10	causation 59:15
137:1,25 138:1	238:4,17,25	65:20 66:14,17	cause 58:25
138:21 139:16	239:8 240:10	129:20 211:23	63:1 114:7
140:8 141:14	240:16 241:24	226:12 235:25	160:13 210:21

[cause - column]

Page 9

212:16,17	chairman	83:7 206:9	coached 46:13
215:12 223:6,9	237:1	chinese 47:8	coast 8:14,16
caused 207:13	challenge 78:10	choices 82:9	coauthor 30:8
236:5	challenging	choose 25:20	235:21
causes 231:24	153:22	chose 64:18	cohort 5:19
232:22,25	chance 60:1,4	82:7	73:2,7,13 74:11
233:5	154:17 177:14	chosen 206:18	147:7,12,24
causing 211:17	225:2	chris 7:2,10,13	148:5,10,13,15
222:5	chang 5:20	96:6 194:22	148:24 149:8
cer 244:14	17:24 168:12	christopher	149:13,21,22
cdc 39:19,22,25	168:18	2:11	156:22 168:12
40:4	change 13:8	chronological	168:18 178:17
cell 237:11,19	106:7 178:10	34:17	188:2 220:14
237:20 238:5,8	245:6	chrysotile	220:23 241:3
238:17,24	changed 106:8	208:23	cohorts 72:15
239:7 240:9,16	137:5 168:6	cite 47:15,19	146:13
cells 98:24	239:13	cited 214:21	coincidence
center 57:10	changes 11:15	city 120:10	114:19
certain 39:10	41:22 42:10	claiming 191:6	coincidentally
73:23 120:20	135:14,17,22	clarify 100:12	65:19
210:10 222:2	136:19 139:13	clarity 51:23	coins 119:17
certainly 56:5	140:18 245:5	166:2,4	colette 4:12
64:21 103:13	changing	clarke 12:16	95:12
136:19 172:3	136:25	class 146:14	colleague 33:10
209:16 224:13	characterizati...	147:12,24	33:24 236:1
225:11	78:8	clear 42:8	colleagues
certainty 138:6	characterize	45:13 52:2	211:23
certificate	53:11	105:13 152:15	collected
244:21	chat 61:7,10	155:4 188:6	122:11
certified 1:11	85:11,24 91:8	219:12	collecting 167:3
244:4,6	91:19 95:22	clearly 46:13	collection 34:23
certify 244:8	142:15 174:23	clinical 219:14	college 132:23
certifying	175:15 204:22	close 66:6,9	133:4 214:10
244:25	che 5:19 168:18	118:8 122:8	color 11:15
cfr 209:5	check 19:6	closely 81:10	column 80:18
	65:10,11,14		173:25 174:18

[column - confidence]

Page 10

181:3 193:3,5 216:1 combination 62:10 combinations 39:8 combined 9:11 152:20 combines 159:7 combining 62:12 come 35:8,22 35:24,25 36:5 102:1 138:14 comes 30:1 coming 35:11 107:16 commencing 1:14 comment 74:24 106:25 160:19 172:4 202:1 203:3 commentaries 12:12 commentary 78:12 commenting 41:6 comments 36:3 committee 7:3 237:2 common 122:18 commonly 140:19	communicate 213:24 214:13 214:23 communicating 214:5 communication 213:14 communicati... 88:24 234:22 community 214:3,16 215:3 companies 83:20 137:7,8 216:7 company 131:11 compare 19:8 115:17 compared 11:4 44:5 158:24 159:9 167:21 182:4 224:4 compares 11:4 comparing 99:11 115:22 comparison 159:15 compatible 122:10 compensation 97:4 competent 211:24 competing 92:20,23 93:10	complained 107:11 complete 34:23 90:2,10,21 211:14 completely 66:15 77:3 communicati... 91:15 130:4,19 130:19 136:3 144:8 220:16 complex 15:5 complicated 71:12 122:3,4 141:3,8 complies 8:21 component 72:9,19 components 67:9 72:14 composition 136:14,20 137:5 139:14 140:18 compositions 140:4,5 comprehensive 50:15 149:12 149:16,21 computer 11:22 175:16 175:22 concepts 226:7 concern 32:9 54:24,25 concerned 235:22	concerning 30:5 32:25 210:15 concerns 39:1 39:16,22 55:1 concise 187:22 concluded 213:2 243:7 conclusion 41:6 155:20 156:6 156:12 187:19 188:9 196:4 212:10 219:3 222:8 conclusionary 101:19 conclusions 156:4 187:24 188:12 222:25 conditions 4:22 123:7,17 conduct 218:19 219:21 conducted 230:2 conference 8:7 confidence 66:11 114:14 114:17 115:8 115:16 116:4 116:13 118:1,3 118:12,15,23 119:3,10,22 120:1,3,24,25 121:14,25 122:7 179:24
--	---	--	---

180:5 181:15	190:12,15	constitutes	continued 4:1,3
181:16 183:19	conjure 119:18	224:16	5:1,3 6:1,3
183:21 184:21	consensus	consult 93:14	15:20
185:7,10,19	60:12,24	consultant 29:2	continuous
187:11 188:13	consequence	consultation	64:22
188:15 190:9	151:19	83:18 84:11	contract 130:24
191:24 192:21	consider 48:22	87:12 216:5	contrast 144:13
192:23,25	73:8 78:22	consulted 28:19	147:6,22 149:8
193:8,10,12,13	172:3 236:17	consulting	159:2,11,13
195:9,13	considerable	28:23	contrasting
196:20,22	118:23	contagion	148:18
197:1,22	considerably	163:6	contributed
200:11 203:16	115:18,19,20	contain 210:9	87:7
203:18 204:6	116:4,5,7,20	210:17 231:2	control 33:9,16
confirm 22:19	117:16 120:3	contained	36:6,7 73:3,14
58:1	183:23,25	15:23 43:3	92:5,7,9 146:14
confirming	185:11,22	47:18 48:10	147:7,25 148:6
68:20 240:21	204:7	55:5,21,22	148:10 149:8
conflict 57:5	considerations	containing	156:22 188:1
83:14 87:21	221:11,14	210:8,16 213:1	220:15,23
92:18 93:6	226:9	213:3 231:1	241:2 244:24
96:25 97:6,19	considered	contains 44:12	convention
109:7 127:3	14:9,16,21 15:6	47:3	224:16
144:15,22	15:16 16:17,18	contamination	conventions
145:3,8	16:18 104:5	53:9	225:7
conflicts 57:21	129:12 158:1	contest 22:18	converse
124:22 126:20	171:5,8 172:6	contested	206:21
126:25 143:8	218:21 221:15	137:19	convey 79:22
conformity	225:14 241:13	context 33:9	copies 11:1,2
221:10	considering	56:20 158:11	12:25
confused 72:6,7	117:22	226:5 239:5,6	copy 11:2 60:19
74:4	consistency	contexts 157:17	85:11 86:3,6,23
confusing 96:2	225:21 226:11	continue 87:20	87:1 91:9,11
96:12	consortium	145:12 154:2	96:15 124:3
confusion	4:11 95:6,12	188:8	162:17,19
109:12 146:4			196:7,8 205:6

[copy - d2]

Page 12

209:23	196:1,14 203:7	235:21	criteria 135:23
corn 137:11,13	203:18 204:7,8	course 15:13	critical 5:6
137:13,21	223:20 227:3	34:21 55:13	127:23 128:4
correct 8:16	231:19,21	105:6 186:4	217:21 218:11
20:5 30:19 39:2	233:15 238:6	208:13	criticize 141:24
39:3 52:22,23	239:14 245:4	court 1:1,11 7:8	crr 244:14
55:5,8,9 58:21	corrected 9:21	8:19 9:1 18:12	ctisi 2:13
58:22 72:24,25	correction 9:6	20:14,17,21	cumulative
76:1 83:23 85:6	9:24 42:11	21:1,23 31:21	13:24 67:15
85:7 87:16 88:2	correctly 10:14	45:16,23 87:7,9	curious 218:18
90:16,17,19,20	67:7 97:8 157:2	94:9 202:6,10	current 27:1
90:22,23 92:1,2	158:13 210:12	242:19,22	currently 23:25
92:15 97:20	corresponding	243:1 244:5,25	24:1 33:4,13
98:6,17 99:13	127:25 128:2	covered 47:21	74:8 240:15
100:1,3,11	cosmetic 43:11	55:24 201:15	cut 189:22
112:7,9,9	93:4 137:23	232:2 233:24	cutpoint 65:5
124:10 125:11	231:14	234:9	cutpoints 64:22
125:13,20	counsel 54:2	covers 116:16	65:1,5
126:14 129:4,5	55:12 88:9,24	116:17	cv 30:18 32:23
129:7,8 132:9	89:6 183:4	cox 173:23	33:2 133:21
133:24 140:1	208:21 215:23	cramer 18:10	d
140:10 144:16	216:13 234:20	18:20 112:6	d 3:1 4:1 5:1
144:23 146:2	235:4 241:25	123:20 125:3	6:1
149:13,23	counsels 53:7	125:17	d.w. 125:3
160:3,25 161:3	count 66:25	cream 177:8	d.w.c. 110:19
165:13 169:24	219:6,7,16	180:10	111:9,14
169:25 170:1	220:3	creating 109:12	d1 3:14 70:14
171:3,11,13	counted 219:19	credentials	d10 5:9 142:11
172:18 177:24	counting 221:8	129:17 233:20	d11 5:12 162:2
180:5,7,11,13	countries	234:2,5,6	d12 5:16 168:14
181:4,12,18,22	226:13	credibility	d13 5:21 173:8
182:5,10,22,23	couple 13:22	212:1	d14 6:6 194:2
182:25 183:7	23:13 35:20	credible 43:21	d15 6:10 204:16
183:12 184:21	36:11 43:8	220:17	d2 3:20 82:18
184:22 186:25	48:16 74:2	credit 194:22	
187:1 195:25	169:14 211:21		

[d3 - davidson]

Page 13

d3	3:22 85:15	12:1,4,5,13	82:14,21 84:2	142:17,20
d4	4:6 91:2	13:2,3,13 14:18	84:15 85:12,19	143:2,6 144:12
d5	4:9 95:8	15:24 16:24	85:22,25 86:4	144:20 145:21
d6	4:14 106:11	17:4,9 18:15,18	86:11,14,19	146:3,8 148:11
d7	4:16 108:9	18:25 19:4,8,14	87:3,4,19 88:8	149:18 150:10
d8	4:21 123:5	19:21 20:24	89:12,17,21,23	150:13 151:5
d9	5:6 128:3	21:3,12 22:7,10	90:25 91:7,12	153:1 154:19
daniel	123:20	22:12 23:24	91:18,21,22	155:19 156:5
data	34:8,20,24	24:13,18,19,25	93:16 94:11,20	156:10,13,18
	36:16,18 44:5	25:2,11,18 26:9	95:15,21,24	156:19 158:17
	48:23 68:8,8	26:13,24 27:5	96:3,6,9,13,16	159:17 160:1
	69:1,4,9,12,17	27:23 28:5,11	96:20,24 97:16	160:10 161:4,7
	77:5 78:4,23	28:21 31:3,5,7	100:4,15 101:9	161:14,19,21
	92:6 107:17,19	31:15,22 35:16	101:16,24	162:13,20,25
	114:15 122:10	36:18,21 38:12	102:4 103:7,10	163:5,7 164:3
	153:5,14	40:10,22 41:8	104:22,25	166:5,13 168:7
	154:21,24	41:21 43:15	105:6,11,22	168:21 169:17
	155:1 156:21	45:2,12,20,22	106:15 107:10	169:22 170:2
	178:5,6,12	46:3,8,16,22,24	107:13 108:7	170:12,24
	184:16 186:18	47:23 48:2,5,18	108:15,21	171:6,14
	188:1 200:4	49:8,17,20,25	109:2,6,17,20	172:24 173:5
	211:25 222:6	50:5,18 51:4	109:25 110:7	173:10,15
date	11:12	52:3,24 53:4	111:21,23	174:5,8,12,15
	19:25 21:15	54:19 55:10	112:10,17,21	175:4,8,13,16
	27:11 52:9	56:8 57:22 58:2	113:1,4,16,19	175:20 176:6,9
	60:14 82:25	58:5,8,14 59:5	115:4 123:11	176:13 177:4
	245:19	59:19 60:21	123:14 124:4,5	177:17 178:20
dated	244:18	61:2,5,8,12,18	125:14,21	179:1,6 180:8
dates	216:14	62:4,15 63:4	126:18,23	180:14,20
	217:1,1	64:2,7,16 67:22	127:10,18,21	181:8,9,19,25
davidson	2:22	68:5,16,21 69:8	128:10 130:14	182:3,9,15,21
	3:5,7 7:9,16,20	69:21 70:1,4,11	132:21 134:13	183:6,18 184:3
	7:24 8:4,8,10	70:23 72:1 74:6	134:15 135:11	184:9 185:2,4
	8:15 9:4,25	75:14,19 76:21	137:3 139:1,11	185:16 186:3,7
	10:6,10,12	77:4,24 78:13	139:23 141:9	186:12,14
	11:10,18,21	81:14 82:6,11	141:22 142:5,9	188:10 189:2,9

[davidson - deposition]

Page 14

189:14,18,22	103:12,24	declined 134:19 135:1 136:6	deliver 147:15 243:3,4
189:24 190:2,4	104:11,14	defend 130:7	delivery 243:2
190:14,18	106:3,23	defendant 2:20	demonstrate 155:4 222:2
191:1,11	107:14,18,25	defendant's	227:1
193:17,21	109:18		demonstrated 47:8 211:5
194:7,14,20,24	day 58:13 83:2	3:14,20,22 4:5	demonstrates 210:25 220:18
195:23 196:3,5	83:3 197:9	4:8,13,15,20	denying 240:21
196:18 197:8	242:12 245:22	5:5,8,11,15,21	deodorant 176:24 177:7
197:20 200:20	days 16:14	6:5,9 70:14	180:9
201:3,10 202:8	104:4 219:5	82:18 85:15	depend 119:14
202:13,17,24	dc 12:25	91:2 95:8	depended 35:2
203:24 204:5	dealt 168:4	106:11 108:9	dependent 158:11
204:21 205:2,9	debunk 146:19	123:5 128:3	depending 73:16 178:8
206:7,12,14	debunked	142:10 162:1	depends 100:17
207:18 208:9	146:11 148:4	168:13 173:7	145:5
208:11,14	debunks 147:11	194:1 204:15	depose 15:25
209:11,14	147:18	defending	deposed 84:16
227:11,17	december	96:10,17	87:8 89:5,7
228:2,7,12	35:21	189:10	90:16
229:10,20	decide 171:19	defense 87:8	deposition 1:8
230:8,13,16,20	decided 171:17	112:7	9:20 10:18
231:22 232:3,7	decision 72:24	define 115:18	12:17,23 13:18
232:19 233:3	73:2	116:6	13:21 15:18
234:3,12,18	decisions	defined 67:24	16:21 31:6,20
235:2,8 236:16	171:22	157:11	45:14 47:22
237:5,9,18,22	declaration	definitely 163:1	49:19 50:23
238:12 239:12	3:20 82:16,19	definition	55:25 78:2 89:2
239:19 240:24	85:5 215:17,25	58:20 64:18	96:10,17 101:5
241:7,10,15	declared 92:20	definitive 222:2	101:21 102:5
242:1,4,7,11,15	decline 134:24	degree 113:21	
242:21	135:24 136:7	114:3,7 115:23	
davis 4:12 18:7	136:18 139:16	120:20,21	
94:5,7 95:7,13	139:21 140:8	131:18,21	
97:24,25	140:16 141:14	138:6	
100:19 101:7	141:15	delicate 107:4	
101:21 102:12			

[deposition - discrepancy]

Page 15

103:20,25	designing 34:2	116:23 117:5	direction 43:9
113:2 128:15	34:2	117:13,20,21	212:10 244:24
189:5,11 232:2	designs 73:3	118:5,11,12,14	directions
234:10 236:15	147:3,21	118:18,21	60:13,24
238:3,21 241:6	desk 38:9	differences	directly 54:25
243:6	despite 26:14	104:17 116:25	disadvantages
depositions	116:24	117:9 167:2	73:14
13:5,9	detected 55:2	different 42:21	disagree 40:23
deposits 210:7	detection 54:10	67:25 81:5,20	41:7,17 72:2,4
210:16 230:25	56:3	81:21 82:2 90:1	73:1,5,12 94:2
231:6,17	determinant	109:9,20 115:1	94:4 167:8
depth 103:14	220:24	115:2,9 116:1	215:14,15
derive 44:3	determine	116:14 118:20	223:16
describe 158:9	61:21 80:9 82:7	130:20 138:15	disagreed 215:7
158:15 203:3	125:16 138:18	166:3 167:23	discern 15:9,15
211:24 223:22	164:8	167:24 184:11	discipline 225:5
228:3 229:14	determines	187:15 188:21	disclose 30:20
described	148:8	205:3 226:12	32:8,8,17 93:19
152:12 225:9	determining	226:13,13,14	97:11 144:1
225:10 228:14	73:9	differs 164:16	disclosed 19:22
describes 65:25	develop 207:14	165:6	29:7 31:9,24
describing	developed 34:5	difficult 15:9	126:19 127:1
155:7	58:24 73:17	77:25 78:9	145:4
description	developing 60:1	138:5 139:25	disclosing 32:2
3:13 4:4 5:4 6:4	151:19 154:7	153:22	disclosure
221:13 228:1	192:20 225:6	dig 171:25	32:14 97:1,19
descriptive	development	dimensional	124:21
163:25	58:21 170:15	71:7	disclosures
descriptor	197:24 224:18	dimensions	110:2,8
158:8 159:15	develops 59:11	71:13 73:9	discovered
descriptors	diagnostic	direct 151:19	225:5
230:7	135:17,22	222:17,18	discovery
design 73:2,7	dial 167:21	239:16 244:24	234:21
designed	differ 114:21	directed 106:23	discrepancy
224:15	difference 68:6	111:20	241:2
	68:13 115:10		

[discussed - dr]

Page 16

discussed 35:18	102:16 105:20	42:14,21 44:8	12:6 13:4 14:12
discussing	106:16 107:4	47:10 48:7,17	16:7 19:24
149:24	107:14,24	49:1,6,10 50:8	22:13 24:20
discussion	110:9 111:20	50:13,15,20,25	25:12 31:8,23
13:25 17:3 57:2	119:20 124:2,6	53:13,15 54:18	45:24 46:5,11
96:23 145:15	139:24 141:24	55:11 207:2	46:18,25 47:4
167:13 168:1	152:9 153:3,25	216:16,18	48:6,19,25
202:12 208:17	155:8 158:18	235:5,9	49:21 50:6 51:6
237:7	160:11 170:3	doing 56:24	51:7 52:4 53:5
discussions	174:25 179:18	92:5 112:23	53:24,25 55:11
13:23	179:25 186:21	131:25 213:21	56:1,9 58:15,16
disease 62:11	187:17 192:17	dollars 23:16	58:19 61:13
79:24 135:15	195:4 196:12	domain 126:4	70:3 74:7,18
135:19 138:5	199:23 200:6	dose 100:20	75:1,3 79:15
141:1 151:19	201:4 209:8	104:11,15	80:24 83:22
224:5,25 229:6	215:16 232:9	105:14 106:3	84:17 89:24
disingenuous	240:4 241:8,11	106:20	97:10 99:2
102:22	doctor's 177:13	double 221:8	101:6,17 102:7
display 116:10	document 41:3	doubt 112:2	103:8,11 112:6
disruptions	41:5 44:14,15	douche 176:25	113:13,20
35:14	44:17,20,25	177:7	125:17,17,23
distinction 44:1	45:6,11 47:4	douching 4:21	125:23 128:11
68:11 170:4	53:20,24,24	5:12 123:6,15	128:17,24
distorted 225:8	54:20,22 55:3	161:8,15 162:2	129:17 130:9
distortion	60:19,23 61:14	162:13 163:14	131:4,18,21
220:7	82:23 175:19	164:1 166:3	132:8,12,22
district 1:1,1	176:5 182:2,17	181:3,12,20	133:3,6,9,12,17
divulge 25:9	208:22 209:7	182:4	134:16 141:10
divulging 25:5	210:6 216:15	download	142:23 143:8
doctor 8:20	216:20	175:7	144:14,14,21
19:16 25:20	documented	downloads	145:2,8,9,24
39:13 61:11	224:1	175:19	157:3 159:18
69:24 75:15	documents	downplaying	162:21,24
77:9,25 78:14	11:4 12:7,9,12	149:7	163:8 164:11
78:17 80:1,16	14:8,15,19 15:6	dr 7:12,14 9:6	166:14 171:7
99:12 101:2	16:1,3,8 38:22	9:17 10:11 12:2	177:6 178:21

[dr - entitled]

Page 17

181:10 182:22 183:1,7 184:10 185:7 186:15 189:15 190:5 196:6 202:25 204:10 205:13 205:16 206:15 208:20 210:5 211:7 215:5 227:18 237:10 238:22 239:20 240:14 241:21 drafted 41:22 41:25 42:7,13 drafting 35:2 drive 153:13 driven 34:14 driving 167:1 drop 138:18,20 139:21 dropbox 15:18 15:20 16:14,16 16:22 17:12 19:5 42:16 58:4 169:24 due 25:22 62:14 180:22 duly 8:24 duplicate 11:1 duplicative 15:4 duration 104:16 105:14 dust 236:5	e e 2:1,1 3:1,11 4:1,3 5:1,3 6:1 6:3,12 8:23 30:11 83:7 168:20 174:22 204:18 244:1,1 245:1,1,1 earlier 11:16 184:11 191:12 205:4 207:22 233:12 early 54:8,9 138:13 earned 21:14 22:21 26:17 earnings 24:9,9 24:22 25:13,24 26:5,5,15 ears 110:14 easier 86:9 91:17 193:7 easily 66:12 easy 90:14 141:3 echeverria 21:1 89:22 editor 130:9 editorial 18:16 18:21 130:20 editorials 18:8 18:10,21 editors 36:3 edt 1:14 243:7	effect 115:9 136:23 147:19 157:15 164:15 165:5 167:2 effects 4:16 108:10,16 137:23 157:23 158:1 efficient 213:24 egilman 130:22 131:4,6,18 133:3,6,9,12 144:14,21 145:8,9 egilman's 130:9 eight 23:8 198:16 either 22:19 102:6 125:23 126:13 131:17 151:16 element 64:23 elizabeth 143:19 emails 88:18 embodies 120:20 embody 71:14 employees 127:5 employment 24:1 ended 29:6 endometri 117:13	endometriosis 4:18 108:12,18 113:22,23 114:4,6 115:24 115:25 116:12 117:14,14 120:15 121:8 121:20 122:13 122:16 endorse 180:18 180:25 ends 214:4 energetic 131:7 enormous 134:8 171:23 178:10 ensuing 87:6 entire 72:12 77:11 102:5 147:18,19 149:10 177:14 entirely 55:7 entirety 41:3 149:6 entities 115:22 entitled 1:10 3:14 4:5,8,15 4:20 5:5,8,11 5:15 6:5,9 9:9 15:25 16:6 24:11,24 25:6 28:2,15,20 45:7 60:23 70:15 91:3 94:15 95:9
---	--	---	---

[entitled - evidence]

Page 18

108:10 123:6 123:15 125:9 127:23 128:4 142:11 162:2 168:8,14 173:19 194:2 194:12 204:11 204:16 209:4 217:21 218:10 222:19 entry 159:1 environment 4:6 91:3,24 environmental 209:4 236:5 epa 17:13,14 43:22 44:10,11 44:14 46:25 53:23 54:20,22 55:3 208:22 210:9 epi 61:21 epidemiologic 167:25 190:24 214:16 218:20 epidemiologi... 71:6,11 75:7,21 152:3 156:21 196:13 201:5 210:24 219:15 220:17 222:21 229:13 epidemiologi... 211:5 epidemiologist 213:11	epidemiologi... 214:9 epidemiology 125:9 131:19 131:22,25 132:17,24 133:4,7 157:21 157:22 214:10 224:19 225:8 225:15 237:4 epithelial 4:9 94:22 95:4,10 138:9 epstein 2:22 61:4,6 85:21,24 86:17 89:16,19 91:19 109:14 109:19,23 110:6 112:19 113:3,5,10 142:7,15,19 146:1,5 156:7 156:16 173:3 174:3,7,10,14 184:6 193:20 194:19 204:24 equipped 214:11 error 9:22 100:18 164:15 165:4 220:13 errors 115:14 especially 138:3 164:15 165:5 226:11	esq 2:5,5,11,16 2:22,22 established 224:6,11 establishing 64:22 estimate 21:16 22:20 23:7 66:13 88:5 99:22,23,25 120:13,19,20 121:10,11,11 121:15 138:10 170:14 178:11 218:19 estimates 66:3 66:7 82:1 114:13,18,24 116:1 117:5,21 117:23,24 118:3,15,19 119:6,13 120:7 164:15 165:5 167:3 197:22 198:21 199:2 203:4,4 229:16 estimating 22:2 22:15 et 3:19 4:7,12 4:19,24 5:7,10 5:14,20 6:8,12 70:19 80:24 91:5 95:13 108:13 123:9 127:24 128:6 142:13 162:5	168:18 194:5 204:19 evaluate 71:9 evaluated 78:21 236:24 241:1 evaluation 44:4 56:17 103:15 170:11 212:25 212:25 213:2 221:12 239:4 evaluations 214:12 events 79:12 eventual 35:5 everybody 86:22 242:12 evidence 5:10 40:16 41:12,19 41:19 43:8,21 44:2,5 47:17 48:10 64:13 88:18 140:10 140:14,15 141:13,21 142:13,22 144:8 190:24 210:24 215:11 221:22,22 222:9 223:19 223:23 224:17 224:17 225:15 225:17,20,25 226:2,2,6,23 239:7
---	---	--	---

[evil - fact]

Page 19

evil 110:18,18	94:6,10,15 95:1	56:11 57:5	93:11 141:1
ex 59:15 127:12	95:3,8 106:10	60:12,23 63:6,9	161:10,17
exactly 66:18	106:11 108:8,9	63:15,23 84:20	162:4,12,15
130:13 157:13	122:25 123:5	84:22,25 88:10	163:13 167:4
212:9	127:22 128:3	89:8 90:15	170:14 210:11
examination	142:6,8,11	93:19,21	235:23 236:5
3:3 10:9 208:18	145:14,23	106:12,24	241:3
227:16 241:19	146:2,4 161:8	107:6 110:20	exposures
examined 8:24	162:2 168:8,14	110:20 111:15	212:22
49:15 101:7,20	172:25 173:6,7	125:2,3 126:12	express 39:1,22
241:5	193:19 194:2	145:10,14,24	222:14,15
examining	194:19,25	234:14,23	expressed 60:8
241:13	204:11,15	236:19,24	81:4,5 120:22
example 121:21	205:11 209:15	expertise 43:19	146:12
152:17 177:23	209:17,19,25	experts 3:21	expressing
examples	215:24 230:10	51:13 56:16	119:4 120:23
119:17 225:12	230:13	82:20 127:7,14	expression
228:22	exhibits 6:18	explain 59:23	121:25
except 110:14	existing 152:13	119:7 135:24	extent 55:24
exception 67:6	expect 35:22	explained 75:2	174:25 233:22
excess 211:4,5	38:19	explains 51:7	extra 22:2
226:17	expedited	explanation	extrapolate
excuse 84:18	242:16,17	117:11	61:20
96:5,8 189:3	243:1	explicitly 54:25	extremely
190:14 213:12	expedites	57:20	71:12
excused 243:5	242:18	explore 53:20	eyeballing
exhaustively	experience	exploring 29:4	116:18
241:5	118:7 131:10	exposed 9:10	eyes 110:15
exhibit 3:13,14	132:15 133:13	exposure 5:14	174:17
3:20,22 4:4,6,9	214:7	17:25 33:9 34:6	f
4:14,16,21 5:4	expert 4:13	35:10 36:20	f 244:1
5:6,9,12,16,21	27:2,3,6,21,22	40:17 41:14	face 7:25
6:4,6,10,14	28:3,7,16 29:1	59:16 62:14,25	fact 26:14
69:23 70:14	29:7 30:21	67:15,16 79:6	54:24 55:3
82:15,18 85:13	31:10,24 32:4	79:13,23 80:19	65:23 76:14,15
85:15 91:1,2,23	32:11 51:5,6,16	81:22 82:3	

[fact - first]

Page 20

85:3 93:20	familiar 37:14	fibers 43:23	200:19 201:21
106:3 107:16	37:16,25 38:3	47:9,18 48:11	202:3 219:21
107:18 130:22	38:20 39:4,8	79:13 213:1,3	220:5,22
149:11 155:10	40:11 60:22	221:20 222:4,5	229:13
159:18 210:16	61:13,15 70:24	fieldwork 34:2	finding 108:25
211:13 215:8	71:1,18 73:18	34:23	229:25
221:17 237:1	82:22 126:1,2,3	figure 9:16	findings 187:23
factor 37:20	133:25 168:25	17:1 23:10	fine 30:17
40:2,5 114:7	169:3 170:21	62:13 107:22	94:25 95:24
224:19,19	195:3 201:6	112:19 189:7	96:22 112:24
225:2	237:3	199:13,13,18	166:8,8 189:12
factors 4:16	familiarity	figured 184:7	192:16 222:6
38:24 108:10	134:2	filed 215:18	240:1 242:19
108:16 132:2	family 113:21	filibuster 45:21	finish 46:7,8,9
138:5,13,14	114:3,7 143:17	filibustering	64:4 67:5 68:18
188:5,7 207:9	143:18 144:5	45:14 49:19	68:23 153:20
224:5,6,7,11,24	fashion 183:2	102:7	158:21 181:6
225:9,12	fatal 71:14	final 92:3	232:15
factual 76:17	fatally 218:24	113:14 187:19	finished 46:9
factum 76:10	favor 208:12	204:11	46:10
failed 92:21	fda 43:22 47:1	finalizes 17:15	finishing 68:18
faint 166:9,11	53:24 54:13	financial	firm 83:19
fair 10:4 48:4	federal 21:23	143:25	110:21,22
54:1 103:2	127:13	find 38:23	111:15,16
119:1,2 139:2	feel 130:8,13	41:16 57:24	112:1 125:2,4
166:24 217:14	168:3	58:9,10 69:14	125:11 129:21
232:6 240:6	feeling 138:8	95:25 100:19	130:24 131:11
fall 36:15 88:11	166:11 207:23	100:23 106:3	firms 83:19
89:9 137:12	208:5	109:5 117:10	216:6
fallen 134:17	fell 135:4 136:2	142:2 147:1	first 8:24 17:24
135:13	fellow 132:23	158:16 166:16	35:5 36:2 74:24
fallopian 17:8	133:3,10,18	168:24 192:7	93:25 95:6
77:6 78:4,24	felt 130:6 168:3	195:18 196:25	108:18 113:2
79:5 151:17	female 132:1	197:15 198:12	113:21 114:3,7
false 220:16	ferraro 110:21	198:15,20,20	115:23 122:6
	111:15 112:1	199:11 200:9	128:2,17

[first - frustrated]

Page 21

135:15 139:13	foregoing 244:8	196:15 200:15	195:20 203:10
140:5 161:10	245:2	200:23 201:8	218:12
161:17 168:12	forensic 103:14	203:19 204:4	foundation
191:25 193:3,4	forget 85:23	207:15 213:1	49:14 143:17
204:13 218:18	forgive 115:11	227:22 228:16	foundational
225:5 232:2	115:13,14	229:17 231:20	55:24
238:15	forgotten 186:9	232:23 234:16	four 20:10
firsthand	186:15	234:24 235:7	31:18 35:7
137:18	form 13:10	236:14 237:16	45:15 50:1
fits 148:9	24:10 25:15	237:21 238:10	80:17 201:17
five 9:12 34:24	34:12 40:7,19	239:1,15	fourfold 111:9
35:7 53:1 80:18	40:25 41:15	240:18	frequency 65:7
139:6 192:6	43:5 49:4 54:3	forms 24:24	66:11 67:15,17
204:1	57:19 59:2,17	25:5 120:22	67:24 72:16
flaw 222:12	61:24 63:2 68:1	formula 62:2	104:15 105:14
flawed 218:13	68:9 71:24 73:4	formulation	165:20 173:20
218:25 219:15	75:9 81:12,23	79:2	frequent 3:15
flaws 51:7	83:24 84:13	formulations	58:17,20 59:11
71:14,15,15	87:17 88:3	43:11	59:25 64:19
218:8	93:13 97:13	forth 36:4	70:16
flipping 119:17	100:2 112:8	131:12	frequently
flop 2:21	114:9 125:12	fortunately	58:24
florida 2:12	125:19 126:15	163:5	fresh 103:17
fluctuate	126:21 127:15	forums 214:2	165:15 169:5
119:15	130:11 132:19	forward 19:13	front 16:8,11
fly 38:9	136:9 138:23	78:11	18:24 19:3
focus 174:1	139:4,19	forwarded	30:25 31:13
follow 69:6	140:11 141:18	16:23	39:14 42:6 45:8
136:7 221:6	144:17 149:14	foul 102:13,24	57:9 70:8,10
following 56:15	157:9 163:17	found 9:22	86:7 98:13
59:4 245:5	170:16 172:8	42:19,21 58:16	129:23 146:7
follows 8:25	178:24 180:6	58:19 66:1,16	153:10,11
font 98:11	180:12 181:5	66:18 104:11	172:19 194:8
footnote 77:9	181:13,23	121:3 150:4	195:25 223:1
77:11,13,16,20	182:6 183:13	151:25 152:3	frustrated
	184:1 185:12	165:8,23 178:5	102:14 207:24

[frustrating - going]

Page 22

frustrating	73:20 76:5	give	21:17
102:9,10	138:8 148:5		128:19,22
full	214:3	46:17,20 49:14	145:15 148:17
24:1 29:20		71:23 94:18	148:21 150:1
77:20,23		101:4,6,22	152:9 161:4
171:21 193:4	120:13	107:21 109:4	169:19,20
fulsome	48:1	112:22 123:3	171:24 175:6,9
183:14	62:6 93:11	161:18,20	175:14,21
fund	103:4 226:1	162:7 185:1	176:21 180:2
134:12		204:25 213:15	180:25 184:4
funded	11:22	227:5,6 232:16	187:21 191:5
34:22		given	193:17 196:3
143:12,16	73:20	36:9	201:22 202:8
funding	120:12 148:5	86:25 118:15	202:13 206:8
34:16 143:21		223:11	208:8,9 209:7
further	generous	giving	227:7 230:9
171:24	129:14	101:24	237:5 239:24
227:9,15		102:18,21,25	241:8,11
241:16 242:9	genetic	183:4	goes
furthermore	158:2	glad	116:15
104:14	genital	50:17	212:9
future	4:9,22	glance	going
60:13,24	5:12 6:6 41:13	191:25	7:17 15:8
88:1,7	76:8 94:21 95:4	238:15	15:15 20:9 23:8
fuzzy	95:9 104:16	glanced	29:12 35:25
54:17	105:15 123:8	171:17	glancing
	123:17 151:10		7:17 8:2 9:20
g	155:12,22	9:25 16:24 17:4	36:5,8 45:10
	156:24 161:8	23:22 31:20	46:1 49:22 50:6
g	161:15 162:3	38:23 39:9 44:8	56:22 57:1
30:11 168:20	162:14 163:14	45:16,22 52:24	85:12 86:7
168:22	167:3 188:4	73:9 81:3 82:11	95:25 101:10
gabriel	192:18 194:3	go	115:18 116:8
4:24	194:13 195:1	7:17 8:2 9:20	127:22 150:9
122:25 123:9	gerel	9:25 16:24 17:4	153:24 172:21
123:18 124:3	2:4	23:22 31:20	172:24 176:15
game	110:21 111:16	38:23 39:9 44:8	getting
103:2	112:1	45:16,22 52:24	176:16 184:24
gaps	getting	73:9 81:3 82:11	186:17,20
221:19	8:11	115:18 116:8	194:14,15,15
222:7,8	35:1 60:4 102:9	117:10 119:17	198:5 199:11
gather	102:10 168:23	117:10 119:17	226:25 242:13
219:25	194:9	124:21 127:18	
gel			
176:24			
177:7 179:8,10			
180:4 182:24			
183:9,20			
general			
20:6			
40:17 53:19			

[golomb - hear]

Page 23

golomb 2:15,16 7:7,7 202:4 golomblegal.... 2:18 gonzalez 184:13 good 10:11,12 10:15 46:20 86:24 121:15 135:25 138:4 191:3,4 218:21 227:10 242:11 goodman 5:7 6:12 127:24 128:6,25 131:21 132:12 132:22 133:17 146:12 148:12 204:14,19 217:19,20 218:2,10 220:10,11 221:1 goodman's 129:17 132:8 goodness 102:2 gossett 18:15 18:16 government 127:13 grab 143:1 grabbing 108:6 grade 99:5 grant 34:16 graph 116:16 116:17	graphic 116:10 grasp 138:4 great 10:16 11:10 12:19 13:2 83:11 94:11 96:3 110:15,16 112:23 116:24 136:4 142:17 176:9 194:21 242:11 greater 60:2 154:17 greatly 114:23 grew 64:9 group 92:14 199:8 212:4 groups 159:16 214:16 233:13 growing 47:17 48:9 guarantee 219:20 guess 15:4 21:17 25:16 36:13 76:10 124:15 130:5 132:10 136:11 165:14 177:20 200:17 239:18 guessed 81:24 guessing 126:11 guesstimate 76:16	guide 219:3 guys 102:15 175:8 189:19 194:7 gynecological 39:5 133:13 gynecologists 38:1,15 h h 3:11 4:3 5:3 6:3 168:20,22 245:1 habits 135:17 half 111:13 hancock 233:19 hand 8:20 91:9 113:24 130:21 164:25 190:21 handed 90:5 124:2 handing 91:15 150:25 handle 45:3 handwritten 11:23 12:11 hang 169:13 happen 33:12 36:13 120:10 happened 217:5 224:21 happy 7:18 113:11 179:21 180:23,23 192:9 232:16	hard 86:9 107:1 107:2 138:3 161:12 196:7,8 197:2,4 200:14 200:16 208:16 harlow 18:10 18:20 harmonize 77:7 78:5,24 harmony 79:24 harris 17:15 harvard 131:25 hastily 216:19 216:25 hazard 174:20 176:24 177:9 179:9,24 180:3 181:3,11 182:23 183:8 183:10 192:20 200:7 201:13 203:15 hazards 173:23 head 88:20 heading 142:18 health 36:23,23 37:2,6,7,10,12 73:22,23,24,25 127:6 136:1 233:13,14,16 234:7 hear 70:4 86:5 91:12 110:18 161:12 196:23 208:16
--	--	---	---

[heard - implying]

Page 24

heard 38:4 39:19 153:18 174:11 197:9 206:20,23 213:21 214:23 217:9 229:5 hearing 107:2 197:3,4,5 heavy 55:17,19 55:22 held 17:3 96:23 202:12 208:17 237:7 help 11:8 20:22 189:21,23 190:3 230:11 helpful 176:12 239:17 helping 34:1 189:24 hesitate 141:5 hesitating 232:10 hey 113:7 189:9 hi 7:9 high 66:10 99:5 150:6,16,18,23 152:6 153:7,16 154:14,23 155:2 157:6,11 158:18,23,23 159:15,21 160:24 191:14 225:4 229:12 higher 60:5 73:3	highest 71:23 74:10 highlighted 114:18 highlights 11:14,15 hill 221:13 226:8,10 hill's 221:11 hinted 79:3 hired 236:19 historic 43:24 47:6 164:13 165:3 historical 54:17 historically 47:12 history 49:23 113:21 114:3,8 115:23 165:25 166:18 192:18 histotype 104:18 hold 44:3,4,6 94:23 162:16 189:18 222:17 honest 166:20 hoops 227:1 hope 136:16 hopeless 220:7 hopelessly 219:15 hopkins 132:11 132:16 hormonal 132:2	hormone 5:17 168:10,16 hours 13:24 31:18,21 45:15 208:21 huh 17:10 42:3 89:21 119:24 146:23 147:4,8 151:6,8 167:16 196:25 199:16 202:17 hundred 122:2 hundreds 172:10,10 hygiene 174:19 177:6 hyperlipidemia 229:6 hypotheses 34:15 hypothesis 222:4,10 hypothetically 121:3 hysterectomy 151:11,17 152:16,19 i i.e. 151:16 iarc 3:20,22 56:10,15,19 57:1,13,16 58:7 60:11,23 82:17 82:19 85:16 212:11,15,20	215:18,19 216:22 236:23 idea 51:2 126:17 127:9 133:5,8 135:21 194:23 231:16 236:4 identical 67:20 114:19 identification 70:20 82:20 85:18 91:6 95:14 106:14 108:14 123:10 128:7 142:14 162:6 168:19 173:9 194:6 204:20 209:21 identify 14:13 19:18 40:5 42:14,22 76:7 95:20 198:6 201:6 imagine 116:9 immunological 188:1 impact 71:16 168:2 implication 73:6 157:13 implications 119:12 implied 9:15 implying 131:16 240:22
--	---	--	---

[important - interpret]

Page 25

important	74:5 81:9 90:18 48:20 93:18 104:5 114:20 138:4 170:10 171:18,20 172:2,2 214:24 216:20 217:2 226:20	indicated 24:16 92:18 124:9,14 124:15 167:25 186:21 212:6 235:20	initiated 130:23 input 37:3 institute 17:7 133:23
imprecise	including 11:3 43:22 47:7 78:23 132:1	indicating 72:11 121:1 152:22 indicator 219:10	institutes 127:6 insufficient 152:23 215:11 intact 77:6 78:4 78:23 79:5
imprecision	inclusive 129:14	individual 219:1 226:18	150:2,4,14,22
117:24	income 23:3,7 23:11,15 24:15 24:21,24 25:6,9	individually 219:2 220:4	152:4 153:6,15 154:6,11,16,22 159:8,13,19
impression	25:13,24 26:16	industrial 231:13	intake 213:18
149:5,9	incontroverti... 226:23	inference 160:9	intention 33:7 33:12,15 34:6,7
inaccurate	incorrect 216:13	infinite 121:5	interest 3:20 57:5,21 82:16
83:25 85:6	increase 137:15	inflammation 4:23 19:3 123:8 123:18	82:19 87:21
87:16 88:2,5	160:16 173:20	influence 129:12 138:15	92:18 93:7,10
inches 96:12,14	175:22 176:1	influencing 126:20 127:1,3	97:7,19 124:22
incidence 62:11	192:19 223:11	214:4	143:8 144:15
135:3,15 136:1	236:6	information 20:4 28:15	144:22 145:3,8 215:18,25
137:1	incredible 229:3	54:14 76:17	interested 120:6 201:20
incident 5:17	incredibly 102:14,14	192:3 200:17	interesting 9:19
168:10,16	independent 53:12 160:13	200:19 201:20	interestingly 175:21
192:20	223:5,8	211:1 213:18	interests 35:3 92:20,24
include 32:13	independently 42:19,25 66:4	214:1,6 228:19	143:25
41:5 57:4 72:16	66:15	information's 20:5	interpret 221:22
77:5 78:4 93:10	indicate 116:2	informed 56:25	
107:25 124:8	119:12 186:20	infrastructure 215:2	
124:13,17	226:17		
167:13 181:17			
188:7 212:21			
212:22			
included 34:5			
47:6 66:12 67:8			
67:12 72:18			

[interpretation - julie]

Page 26

interpretation 160:8 221:10 221:12	interventions 154:13 158:25	it'll 36:1,1 146:21	104:21 105:4 106:25 107:8
interrupt 22:11 31:19 158:25	interview 120:11	iteration 36:2	108:5 112:24
interrupting 46:3,4 197:11	interviewed 75:5,6,20,22 121:6	iterations 36:3	123:2,23
interval 66:12 118:1 119:22 120:1,24,25 121:14,25 122:7 179:24 180:5 181:16 181:17 184:21 188:15 192:21 192:23 193:9 193:10,12,14 203:16,18	introduce 7:6 investigation 143:7 investigations 143:11 investigator 33:25 investigators 36:7 226:14 invite 57:1 invited 236:23 invoices 21:8 involve 27:12 involved 33:11 33:25 69:5 83:20 87:23 216:6 235:17 involvement 87:25 88:7 irrelevant 25:7 issue 93:6 122:4 168:4 197:4,13 224:20 issued 60:12 issues 37:13 48:22 56:11 110:14,15 130:20 132:1 214:14	iwona 4:23 123:9,18 j j 1:10 8:23 244:4,14 j&j 49:1,6 50:9 50:13,19 51:13 208:21 j&j's 49:9 51:6 51:17,20 jack 1:8 3:4,22 4:14 46:21 85:16 106:12 243:6 jama 195:2 january 35:21 49:16 50:23 83:18 216:5 jersey 1:1,13 244:8 jessica 2:22 8:3 9:3,19 11:8 12:21 15:2 16:22 19:11 20:23 24:12 26:21 46:15 47:20 50:3 52:1 60:18 68:17 77:2,15 78:10 86:2 101:3,18 101:23 102:3	145:20 146:2 153:17 161:13 162:9 166:1,9 171:5 173:13 174:24 175:12 180:17 182:13 185:23 190:11 194:10 202:20 206:11 208:4 227:6 jessica.davids... 2:24 joan 143:18 job 10:15 112:23 134:11 john 5:10 142:13,22,24 143:4 johns 132:11,16 johnson 1:3,3 137:8,8 143:19 johnson's 43:2 47:2 53:9 55:21 231:18 joke 94:13 journal 36:8 125:8 214:22 journals 112:5 judge 49:24 101:14 julie 5:7 6:12 127:24,25

[julie - legitimate]

Page 27

128:5,8,9	45:15 50:2,14	176:6 178:12	115:11 130:2,5
204:18	51:1,2,14,15	179:12 180:21	150:7,17
july 83:1	54:18 58:8	185:13 186:18	160:21 183:23
jumping	61:12 62:25	187:12,13	large 157:15
222:16	64:17 67:23	189:3 195:19	largely 122:20
june 11:16	68:2 69:11 71:9	196:13 197:8	larger 69:6
jung 5:19	76:2,12,14,15	200:1,24 201:2	latched 225:6
168:18	76:17 77:3	207:5,9 221:25	late 8:17 54:9,9
k	78:20,20 80:5	224:14 225:1	latency 137:24
k 2:5 8:23,23	81:3,8,15 86:15	226:5 228:18	138:7,11,15,20
17:23	100:21 102:11	229:5,6,11	140:22 141:2,6
katie 5:14 6:8	102:17 107:1	231:8,10	law 83:19,19
162:5 194:4	111:25 112:5	232:11,21,24	110:21,21
keep 19:13	114:10 116:18	233:2,11	111:15,16
94:13 104:25	119:9,16,16,18	240:15	112:1 125:2,4
197:11	121:4,7,7	knowledge	125:11 131:11
kept 42:20	122:18,20	36:11 132:8	216:6
key 167:11	124:13,17	215:2 221:20	lawyer 112:22
kim 17:23	125:10 126:6	222:8,9 245:4	lawyers 42:17
kind 21:17 34:1	126:17 127:5	known 38:2	42:18,24,25
71:7 120:7	130:12,21,21	39:6	53:16 54:12,15
121:17 122:1	131:6,7,13,14	knows 86:21	54:21 56:21
163:24 204:22	131:20,23	143:3	87:8 189:4
219:10 224:23	132:12,16,22	korean 212:4	layout 98:22
kinds 132:1	134:21,22	koushik 33:24	learn 127:11,17
167:23,24	135:1 136:10	92:4	learned 57:1
knew 116:8	136:11,11	kudos 112:23	leeway 101:4
know 15:25	142:23 143:5	kwon 17:24	101:23,25
16:6,9 18:22	143:10 152:18	I	102:18,19,21
19:12 20:15,18	156:16 158:6	I 30:11	102:25
21:22 22:25	159:4 163:15	labeled 58:6	left 9:16 10:1
30:16 32:12	166:10,19	110:25	202:5,5
34:9 35:7,12,24	167:17,22	lack 154:12	legal 2:15 87:12
36:1,2 37:19	168:5 170:7	language 102:3	legitimate
38:11 39:7 45:9	171:23 172:9	102:13 105:3	25:19
	173:14,15,15		

[len - looking]

Page 28

len	143:18	line	66:8,19 111:2 245:6	28:7,25 30:22 31:10,25 32:4	46:21,21 47:14 50:17 53:14,21
letter	3:22 57:13,17,18,19 58:6 83:4,6 85:9,13,16 86:7 130:9 145:4,5 215:19	lines	9:12 65:21 150:1 151:14	32:11 49:2 50:20 55:17	54:24 63:12 64:24 65:4
letters	18:21	lisa	4:7 30:12 91:4	63:7,23 64:11 83:20 84:12,17	69:13,20 73:12 80:5,8,16 88:18
letting	181:6	list	14:10,16,21	87:24 88:25	96:21 99:6
leung	4:7 30:9 30:12 32:13,19 91:1,5		15:16 16:2,9 17:12,22 18:17 19:9 34:18 35:12 37:19 40:1 42:15	93:19 97:5 126:13 127:8 127:14 133:15 144:6 145:3,10 216:7 217:7	103:19,24 104:3,7 108:4 110:8,10 111:5 112:12 114:13 114:14 115:1
level	100:8,17 226:19		50:15 57:21 67:19 78:18	236:20 237:11 238:5,7	115:15 132:4 132:13,13
levin	2:10		171:1,8 172:6	little	144:25 146:20
levinlaw.com	2:13		218:15 221:3	54:16 65:3 72:7	152:13 160:6
liability	1:5	listed	74:12	86:8 91:17	160:11 163:19
license	1:11 244:15		178:23 183:21	101:4,23 107:1	173:24 178:14
life	35:15	listening	108:24	116:10 131:6	184:23 187:12
ligation	76:13 151:11 152:17 152:20	lists	174:19	174:17 190:12 229:25	187:19 192:2,4 192:5,9,10
likely	130:25	literature	62:20 66:2 211:9 214:18 219:7	live	199:11,21,22
limit	114:17		220:17 221:14	llp	199:24 205:5
limitations	148:13,16,25		223:24,25	lock	224:5
limited	46:14 69:16 78:19 80:3,3,10,24 81:16 93:12 155:13,23 156:25		225:10 235:13 236:11 237:12 237:17,24	logical	222:12
linda	123:19		238:25 240:16 241:22	long	39:25 101:1
		litigation	1:5 20:1,14,19 21:15 22:22	56:18 69:6 75:22 103:16	103:12,23
			23:4 26:18 27:1 27:7,14,17,25	longo	104:4 127:4
				17:19 47:4,5 51:6,21	163:20 165:11
				51:23 53:24 55:11	170:10 172:8,9
				longo's	172:10 174:3
				51:7 look	175:1 207:1
				23:2 30:15 32:15,23 44:2	229:12
					looking
					33:1
					44:13,13 45:7
					48:17 63:13

[looking - mdl]

Page 29

64:25 65:6 70:12 90:4,7 92:16 94:17,24 98:7,25 104:12 106:22 110:11 111:3 113:24 114:1 123:24 143:2 146:22 151:3 164:5 165:17 169:14 174:16 176:22 176:23 177:18 191:22 192:5 193:2,6 196:6 199:7,16,18 242:17 looks 114:5 163:15 205:14 losing 102:23 lost 77:1 103:6 lot 22:1 73:13 119:5 122:19 122:19 low 160:15,16 223:10,11 229:12 lower 98:4,17 99:3,20,22 224:10 lucky 176:20 lunch 161:6 lung 158:7 224:21 235:23 236:1,6 lynch 146:12 148:12	lyons 2:5 7:4 15:19 16:14 58:3,6 113:9,11 176:3,8,11 m m 4:23 5:14 6:8 8:23 17:23 123:9 162:5 194:4 made 12:25 16:14,20 20:18 32:24 57:10 72:24 148:3 160:9 magnitude 157:14 158:9 224:4 226:10 mail 83:7 mailed 174:22 main 134:11 210:23 211:22 majority 25:24 26:1 make 9:5,24 12:20,21 15:10 43:24 44:1 46:19 58:10,12 65:5 85:25 87:1 90:14 106:25 107:4 115:5 118:11 120:12 147:23 148:3 151:15 154:5 155:6,6 171:22 193:7 198:17	220:13 222:7 227:7 238:22 makes 59:7 making 86:17 120:7 136:16 170:5 190:19 manhattan 2:23 manner 183:14 manuscript 36:12,14 113:15,18 march 1:13 244:18 mark 82:15 85:12 90:25 94:6 106:9 108:15 122:25 127:22 161:7 168:8 172:24 173:5 193:18 194:15 204:10 209:14,17 marked 69:23 70:19 82:20 85:18 91:5 95:13 106:13 108:13 123:9 128:6 142:14 162:5 168:19 173:8 190:13 194:5 204:19 209:20,24 markedly 151:18	marker 224:24 markers 158:2 market 2:16 marketing 1:4 marking 91:23 94:14,25 95:3 142:6 205:10 mas 1:2 material 10:20 14:20 66:16 171:24 218:23 materials 10:17 14:9,15 15:6,16 15:20,22 16:12 16:16 19:20 47:1 53:6 54:1 169:23 170:8 171:4,8 172:6 math 19:25 mathematical 117:18,19 mathematics 118:2 matter 1:10 120:18 130:23 244:10 matthew 52:5,7 52:17 maximum 21:17 mcgill 29:10,18 29:24 30:1 md 3:18 70:19 mdl 1:2 17:20 20:1 206:18
---	---	--	--

[meager - minutes]

Page 30

meager 2:21	media 214:24	67:14,24 70:18	michelle's
mean 20:9	medical 112:5	149:12,21	189:10
22:18 23:1 26:1	207:2 213:6	212:2 218:19	microphone
27:4 32:5 42:20	214:3	220:1,2 226:22	208:15
44:1 49:6 50:15	meeting 212:20	metals 55:17,19	microscopist
55:18 58:23	meetings 14:4	55:22 56:4	51:17,20
62:1 67:19 75:7	214:1	method 218:25	middle 116:12
75:23 100:8	member 37:17	methodological	147:14 173:25
102:1 105:25	237:1	218:8	174:18 176:17
115:19 116:9	memorized	methodologic...	mill 235:22
119:3 134:22	127:2	218:12	milled 236:3
137:17 140:6	memory 33:2	methods	millers 235:20
140:12 157:12	47:14 90:13	178:18 211:24	mind 12:23
157:17 162:23	103:18 104:8	metric 81:6	20:7 38:11
176:3 181:15	143:18 163:22	micha 5:10	51:15 116:10
219:4 220:22	165:15 216:19	141:25 142:5	130:5 169:6
221:24 225:22	229:4	142:13,22,24	175:6 199:25
meaning 16:17	mentally	143:4,8 144:14	200:2
59:21 151:23	158:22	michele 2:5	mine 243:4
means 59:24	mention 44:22	7:1,10 12:13	mined 236:3
114:15 120:5	212:19	22:11 31:5,17	mineral 136:21
141:4 157:13	mentioned	31:18 45:2,12	137:10,20
244:23	27:10 39:13	47:24 49:18,25	mineralogist
meant 9:17	42:16 51:21	49:25 57:22	43:19
159:12	53:23 64:20	86:5 91:13	minerals 188:7
measure	129:19	94:16 96:17,18	miners 235:19
219:17	mentor 34:1	101:9,25 102:4	minh 4:18
measured	mercy 65:3	103:3 104:22	108:12
43:23	mesothelioma	107:10 111:21	minimum
measurement	235:24	169:24 176:19	21:17
43:20 164:14	message 114:21	177:18 182:1	minute 16:25
165:4	met 13:14,17	186:13 189:12	53:1 163:21
mechanism	13:19,20	191:2 206:10	197:17 237:6
233:6	meta 3:17 9:9	207:19,22	239:3
mechanisms	18:1 64:9,24	208:11 228:8	minutes 17:2
221:21 222:3	65:25 66:10,24	232:3 242:5	23:13,22 48:17

[minutes - nhs]

Page 31

51:21 74:3 139:6 146:21 169:14 187:21 192:6 198:4,6 198:19 201:12 204:1 206:9 miscellaneous 170:8 missing 169:16 misstates 43:6 48:12 55:6 64:12 144:8 201:9 mistaken 126:8 mixtures 5:16 168:9,15 models 173:23 moderate 224:4 224:14 modern 224:19 moment 14:7 23:20 109:4 123:3,12 145:17 161:18 161:20 204:25 monday 242:21 money 21:14 mono 71:7 monograph 3:23 56:17 58:7 85:17 212:12 212:15,20 month 103:15 months 35:20 36:12 56:14 88:12,14,16,21	88:21 112:22 montreal 29:10 29:19,21 30:1 33:10 moorman 97:3 97:10 moot 226:20 morning 10:11 10:12 207:24 motivations 131:15 mouth 102:24 mouthwash 176:25 177:7 180:10 move 20:23 26:21 78:11 89:11 108:3 112:11 139:14 142:3 204:9 241:9 moved 35:13 140:3,3 167:20 moving 19:13 45:9 109:22 mparfitt 2:7 mph 4:19 108:13 msc 1:9 3:4,18 4:14 8:23 70:19 106:13 243:7 multiple 52:11 52:17 82:9 234:14 myong 17:25	n n 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 30:11 168:20,22 naive 130:4 name 4:4 5:4 6:4 10:13 39:9 132:4 168:25 169:3 233:19 names 54:7 206:20,23 naming 194:23 national 17:7 73:23,24 127:6 133:22 natural 213:23 218:22 nature 197:3 198:12 217:10 nci 39:14,15 60:11,23 133:10,18,22 134:10 213:5 214:17,21,25 near 23:8 necessarily 15:21 104:6 191:20 necessary 205:20 need 31:16 46:21 50:2 52:2 52:24 77:19 102:19 122:4,5 128:19 131:10	178:14 183:15 201:21 212:13 239:24 242:20 needed 63:1 218:23 needs 238:20 neither 72:3 never 9:10 35:24,25 38:4 38:21,21,25 41:20 42:20 71:19,20 75:8 75:23 94:12,13 165:12 172:6 213:14,21 214:20,22 219:21 229:12 new 1:1,13 2:23 2:23 15:11 16:3 33:16 47:2,23 48:3 49:17 50:16 55:4 56:16 129:4 135:4 142:18 187:17 205:15 212:7,8 244:7 newcastle 70:25 73:16 newly 205:15 news 17:14 135:25 newsome 206:21 nhs 68:8,8,12 68:14 69:1,3,9 69:12,17 72:6,9
---	---	--	--

[nhs - objection's]

Page 32

72:19	notation	160:24	68:15 69:5	100:2 112:8
niehs	note	12:20,21	71:25 72:10,12	114:9 125:12
nine		159:19 160:2	72:15 125:23	125:19 126:15
noah		244:21	149:11,15,19	126:21 127:15
58:10,12 61:2	noted	184:10	154:25 161:11	130:11 132:19
69:21 85:19,22	notes	12:6	161:17 162:5	134:5 135:7
86:15 89:14		206:9	166:3 178:5	136:9 138:23
91:7,18 105:1,2	notice	6:13	184:5,11,16,20	139:4,19
109:8 112:18		114:16 209:20	184:24 185:8	140:11 141:18
112:21 113:1,7	notion	146:12	185:17 189:1	144:7,17
113:17 142:6		147:11	190:21,22	147:13 149:14
145:22 156:5,9	notions	148:4	193:18 194:5	157:9 159:23
156:15 169:18	november	9:7	194:11 195:2	160:4 161:1
173:1,24		11:13 47:5 52:1	202:15 222:19	163:17 170:16
194:16,17	null	9:16	o'brien's	171:12 177:11
204:21		192:22 205:22	165:23	178:24 179:4
noah.epstein		206:1	object	180:6,12 181:5
2:25	number	69:7	78:7 86:8	181:13,23
non		138:2 151:3	174:25	182:2,6 183:13
60:2,6		194:17 209:18	objection	184:1 185:12
185:10 187:3		209:25 216:3	13:10	196:15 200:15
188:16 190:8	numbers	109:9	23:17 24:10,23	200:23 201:8
191:9,18		119:14 135:10	25:15 26:7,11	203:19 204:4
195:10 196:21		135:13 182:8	26:19 28:1,8,14	207:15 227:22
197:25 199:3		201:25 203:14	34:12 38:5 40:7	228:16 229:17
199:15 200:8		203:22,25	40:19,25 41:15	231:20 232:1
203:17		216:1 219:22	43:5 48:12 49:4	232:23 233:21
nonfinancial		219:23	49:13 50:11,22	234:8,16,24
143:25	numeric	191:23	54:3 55:6,23	235:7 236:14
nonsignifican...		numerical	59:2,17 61:24	236:21 237:16
220:4		191:20,24	62:8 63:2,24	237:21 238:10
nope		nurses	64:12 68:1,9	239:1,15
38:6		73:22,25	71:24 73:4 75:9	240:18 241:4
normal		o	76:19 81:12,23	objection's
213:23			83:24 84:13	28:13
north			87:17 88:3	
126:7			93:13 97:13	
notarized				
32:7				
notary				
1:12				
244:7 245:24				

[objective - opinions]

Page 33

objective	131:1 221:17	94:11 98:21 102:2 124:24	113:10,20 114:2 115:5	222:24 223:16 223:22 229:21
obliged	25:8	143:23 146:3	118:17 120:4	233:10 238:18
observe	218:9	150:19 154:14	122:22 124:4	239:25 241:15
observed		162:25 163:23	124:21 125:22	242:22
	105:12,13 167:2	175:13 184:10 208:3 242:6	127:18 129:3 134:13 141:17	old 219:5 older 76:18
obstetricians		okay 8:10,18	142:9 144:13	once 214:1
	38:1,14	10:3,6,16 11:11	145:12 149:3	oncology 39:5
obstructed		12:4,10 13:14	151:14 156:11	ones 12:16 15:5
	183:4	14:19 17:10	156:18 160:11	18:6 42:23,23
obvious	141:4	18:5,18,25	164:11,22	50:16 67:20
obviously	15:22 103:2 148:21	20:13 21:25 22:20 28:22	165:16 166:7 166:12,22,24	104:4,5,6 171:24,25
occasion	71:20 237:2	29:3,9,22 30:3 30:16 36:22	167:7,10,19 168:7 170:25	198:22
occupational		44:23 48:19	172:17 174:6	ongoing 17:16 33:13
	4:6 91:3,24 235:23	52:24 53:2 55:11,15 58:2,5	174:12,14 175:13 176:21	onset 141:1 open 41:18
occurred	53:18 224:20	58:15 61:19 64:8 67:2,4	176:22 180:2 181:8,25 184:4	174:23 opining 211:15
odds	116:11	80:15 82:22	184:23 185:2	opinion 43:2,13
offer	56:10,19	83:11,12,16	186:24 187:16	43:17,17,18
offered	57:10 81:20 137:9	85:4,14 86:11 87:3,20 88:23	187:18 189:18 190:1 191:3,4	47:2 48:8 50:1 55:4,16,18,20
offering	43:2 43:17,18 55:16 55:20 207:12 232:8	89:11 91:21 92:8,10,16 93:17 94:11,25 95:2,19,20	192:14,14 193:11,16 194:17,20 196:12,19	129:12 130:20 135:12 154:3 207:12 231:23 232:8 239:13
office	7:4,15	96:13,18 97:22	199:20 200:13	239:16
oh	10:19 11:24 18:5 22:4 27:19 29:22 30:12 61:9 67:12 70:6 72:9 87:14 89:12 91:14	98:2,21 99:8 106:6 107:7 108:3,22 109:23 110:4,6 111:7,18,22,24 112:3,11,15	202:6,18 204:6 204:9 206:6,12 207:18 208:7 209:3,13 210:5 216:12 217:10 218:1 222:16	opinions 15:23 37:3 44:3,6,7 48:21 56:6 131:12 132:6 147:23 210:19 213:16,18

[opinions - page]

Page 34

214:19 218:14 opposite 107:12 optimal 60:6 order 158:4 159:5 200:22 224:12 236:4 organization 37:10,15 134:1 134:4,11 organizations 36:23,24 37:8 37:12 213:6,15 214:4,11,21 215:1 orient 185:25 origin 54:17 original 65:1,2 177:25 224:18 originally 54:6 54:12 124:14 184:12 origins 47:7 ottawa 70:25 oules 21:3,4 89:22 outburst 207:25 outcome 164:16 165:6 outcomes 235:24 outreach 36:22 ovarian 3:16 4:7,10,10,16,21 5:6,9 6:7,11 9:11 17:8 18:1	27:14 30:5 32:25 33:6,16 36:24 37:8,20 39:2,16,23 40:2 40:6,17 41:13 58:21,24,25 59:11 60:1,5,13 60:24 61:22 62:17,21 63:1 70:17 91:4,24 93:3 94:22 95:5 95:5,10,11 97:5 104:16 105:15 108:11,17 113:22 114:3 123:7,16 127:24 128:5 134:17 135:4 136:1,5 137:1 137:25 138:21 139:16 140:8 141:14 142:12 142:21 149:23 150:6,16,23 151:10 152:6 153:7 155:2,12 155:23 156:24 157:22,25,25 158:3 159:5,21 160:14 165:25 166:18 170:15 173:22,25 174:20 176:17 177:10 178:2 179:10 188:4 190:23 192:20	194:4 195:2 197:24 204:13 204:17 205:21 207:10,14 210:21 211:1,6 211:10,17 212:17,17 215:10,13,13 217:22 218:11 222:5,20 223:10,12,23 224:9,10 225:13,17 231:24 232:22 232:25 233:6 236:8,12,18 237:3 238:4 241:23 ovaries 154:10 154:18 222:11 overall 159:4 219:3,11 overlap 114:22 115:8,17,20 116:4,5,6,19,20 116:23 117:16 118:23 119:3 119:10 120:3 122:19 183:22 183:25 185:11 185:22 188:15 193:1,9,13 195:11,13,14 196:22 200:12 204:7	overlapped 66:20,23 68:25 190:9 overlapping 187:11 overlaps 107:18 107:22 108:1 191:24 oversight 124:18 own 7:15 43:19 44:4 53:8,12 65:25 86:21 202:3
p			p 2:1,1 4:12 5:10 95:12 142:13 p.a. 2:10 p.m. 243:7 p1 6:14 209:19 page 3:3,13 4:4 5:4 6:4 9:8,13 9:21 89:17,18 95:17 98:7 101:8,20 104:21,24 105:8,19 108:22,23 109:9 110:1,12 142:3 143:21 143:22 145:23 146:24 147:1 150:11 151:2,3 151:4 155:15

[page - parfitt]

Page 35

155:17 160:12	81:25 82:9	169:3,11,22	130:10 148:24
164:21 165:9	86:23,25 90:4	170:11,13	153:10 188:21
177:2 179:17	91:1,3 92:5,6	177:22 179:7	192:15,17
179:19 192:10	92:16,25 93:2	180:25 182:19	199:8,10
193:3 196:9	93:11 94:5,7,15	184:5 185:6,14	205:24 206:2
197:15,18	95:9,19 96:1,15	185:17 186:22	212:6,9 221:5
198:1,10,16	96:21 97:24	187:20,20	236:7
199:14 201:25	98:1,13 100:19	188:14,16,22	paragraph
202:14 203:8	100:25 101:2,7	190:7 191:13	105:13 110:24
209:7,10 210:1	103:12,24	192:12,12	111:1 156:12
210:2,6 218:5	104:7,9,11,14	194:2,8,12	156:14 160:23
223:2,2 225:24	106:23 107:14	195:3,8,9,11,25	165:1 193:4
230:14,22,22	107:18 108:6	196:14,20	paragraphs
245:6	108:10 109:1	197:23 198:2,3	127:3 147:5
pages 101:6	109:18 111:11	198:7,9,11,16	201:18
paid 19:25 20:7	112:13,14	198:16,24	paralegal
20:13,16 83:18	113:9 123:1,3,6	199:1 200:3,7,9	174:13
84:11,25 93:19	123:11,15	200:18,22	parameter 65:6
painfully	124:3,6 125:16	201:1,5,13,17	67:18 115:16
219:12	127:3,23 128:4	201:21 203:13	parameterizat...
pair 110:16,16	128:25 129:3,9	204:2,11,16	82:2
panel 212:14	129:19,20	205:10,12	parameters
236:24	130:7 131:5	212:7,8 220:9	62:12 164:1
papantonio	134:14 141:25	220:10,11	parfitt 2:5 3:6,8
2:10	142:11 143:3	229:4,7,13	7:1,1,13,18,22
paper 4:5,8,15	143:13 144:5	230:6 231:5,8,9	8:1,6,9,12,18
4:20 5:5,8,11	144:15,24	231:11 234:7	9:3 10:3,8 11:8
5:15 6:5,9 30:8	145:1,16	235:12,15	11:11,20,24
30:20,24 31:9	146:18,20	paper's 171:19	12:3,20 13:10
31:16,25 32:13	150:21 152:11	papers 32:3	13:14,17 14:12
32:19 35:5,18	153:11 162:2	35:2,8 63:18	15:2 16:11
35:18,25 36:8	163:15 165:23	66:21 80:9,22	17:17 18:3,9,17
63:9,21,22 64:9	166:3,4,6,16	81:9,15,20	18:19 19:2,6,10
64:20 65:17,21	167:14,15,22	104:2 107:22	19:15 20:4,22
66:13 67:9 68:7	167:23 168:8	108:1 111:25	20:25 21:4 22:6
68:7 74:3 80:8	168:14,25	126:24 127:1	22:9 23:17

[parfitt - past]

Page 36

24:10,16,23	106:22 107:8	186:5,10	116:16,17
25:4,15 26:7,11	108:5 111:19	187:15,17	126:5 131:3,4,5
26:19 27:2,21	112:8,24 113:7	190:11,17,19	139:7 209:5
28:1,8,14 30:24	114:9 123:2,12	191:3 194:10	212:24 214:18
31:12 34:12	123:23 124:1	195:21 196:2	215:1 216:23
36:17 38:5,7	125:12,19	196:15 197:2	participants
40:7,19,25	126:15,21	197:10 200:15	98:4,5 99:10
41:15 43:5	127:9,15 128:9	200:23 201:8	participate
44:24 45:4,18	130:11 132:19	202:19 203:19	56:16 236:23
45:21 46:1,7,15	134:5 135:7	204:4,25 205:3	participated
46:17 47:20,25	136:9 138:23	206:11 207:15	37:17
48:4,12 49:4,13	139:4,19	208:3,7,10,13	participating
49:22 50:3,11	140:11 141:18	208:19 209:13	86:25
50:22 51:22	142:3,25 144:7	209:16,22	participation
53:2 54:3 55:6	144:17 145:17	210:4 227:5,12	29:5
55:23 57:25	145:19 147:13	227:14,22	particles
59:2,17 60:18	149:14 150:8	228:5,16	54:11
61:9,24 62:8	150:12,25	229:17,22	79:14 154:9,18
63:2,24 64:4,12	152:7 153:17	230:11,15,21	159:1 222:10
67:5 68:1,9,17	154:2 155:17	231:20 232:1,5	particular
68:23 69:24	156:9 157:9	232:14,23	39:8
70:2,6 71:24	158:21 159:23	233:21,24	65:8 73:19 76:4
73:4 75:9,16	160:4 161:1,12	234:8,16,24	76:10 98:22,23
76:19,23 77:2	161:18,20	235:7 236:14	98:24 212:20
77:15 78:7	162:9,23 163:3	236:21 237:16	particularly
81:12,23 83:24	163:17 166:1,7	237:21 238:10	71:20 150:6,16
84:13 85:10,14	169:19,25	239:1,15	150:18,22
86:2,6,12,23	170:4,16 171:4	240:18 241:4,9	152:5 153:7,16
87:17 88:3 90:5	171:12 173:13	241:17,20	154:14,23
91:9,14 93:13	174:24 177:11	242:6,9,13,24	155:2 157:6
94:18 97:13	178:24 179:4	243:2,3	158:18,23,23
100:2,14 101:3	180:6,12,17,24	park 126:9	159:12,21
101:18 102:2	181:5,13,23	part 15:17	160:24 166:23
103:9,22 104:1	182:6,13,20	16:19 23:11	partly 141:6
104:20,23	183:1,13 184:1	25:16 34:14	past 21:8 87:24
105:4,9,19	185:12,23	88:5 114:20	118:6 172:12

[patent - plaintiff's]

Page 37

patent	69:17 75:4,6,8,22,24 78:19 79:5 80:4 80:12 155:13 155:24 156:25 185:9,10,21,22 187:3,3 188:14 188:16,20 190:7,8 191:8,9 191:14,18,18 192:23 195:10 195:10 196:21 196:21 197:24 197:25 199:2,3 199:14,15 200:8,8 203:5,6 203:15,17	payments	110:19 pdf 194:23 pdq 17:7 39:14 213:5,12 214:17,21,25 pearson 12:16 peer 235:13 236:11 pending 186:8 202:20,22 pennsylvania 2:17 pensacola 2:12 pension 24:6,8 24:22 25:12,23 26:4 29:25	perineal 3:15 33:8 34:5 35:10 58:24 59:15 61:23 70:16 81:17 93:5,12 162:10 170:14 178:2 197:23 period 69:6 135:23 137:24 138:7,11 140:23 141:2,6 216:23 217:7 217:11,13,15 periods 138:15 permission 9:4 9:5 person 96:7,10 111:24 112:3 125:8,15 132:3 133:1,19 personal 5:16 44:4 168:9,15 173:21 personally 62:22 persuade 43:25 persuaded 41:18 persuasive 212:2 226:6,6 pertaining 33:5 pertains 186:19 ph.d 243:7 perfect 209:23 performed	phd 4:14,19 6:8 106:13 108:13 194:5 philadelphia 2:17 phone 237:11 238:24 240:16 phones 237:19 237:20 238:5,8 238:17 239:7 240:9 phung 4:19 108:4,8,13,18 111:10 physicians 135:18 pieces 133:21 140:13 pile 18:8 45:1 piles 63:16 place 38:23 111:4 175:11 places 203:9 plaintiff 2:3 7:3 144:6 plaintiff's 6:13 30:21 31:10 53:6,16 54:2,21 55:12 57:5 63:6 63:22 88:9,24 89:6 145:9 207:6 209:17 209:19,25 230:9,13 234:14,20,22 235:3
pathologists	135:18	people 8:1 73:17 79:4 120:17 135:5 219:5,6 225:1 230:7	percent 26:1,3 26:5 58:25 59:14 60:5 117:25 121:18 121:22 122:2 122:14 179:24 180:5 181:16 184:21	personally 62:22 persuade 43:25 persuaded 41:18 persuasive 212:2 226:6,6 pertaining 33:5 pertains 186:19 ph.d 243:7 perfect 209:23 performed	
pathway	231:24 233:7				
patients	151:10				
patricia	97:3				
patrick	2:5 7:4 7:10,15 15:19 16:14 58:1 176:6,10,14,15 176:21 209:22 209:24 210:1 230:16,18,19				
patterns	5:12 161:9,15 162:3 162:11,14 163:12				
payment	111:14				

[plaintiffs - presence]

Page 38

plaintiffs	7:8 32:4 57:12 63:10 112:6 206:17 207:3 207:10 234:19	130:7 147:10 148:2 172:1 178:10 186:18 192:8 195:16 197:22 198:9	241:13 possibly 140:3 potential 35:18 53:8 56:10 57:21 124:22 159:1 210:10	215:10,12,20 216:8 222:20 223:9,23 225:17 231:19
plan	233:4,8	198:20 202:2	159:1 210:10	practice 37:11
planning	221:18,19,19	211:2 236:17	practices 1:4 135:22	
232:20	225:23 226:19	potentially	pre 6:13 209:20	
plausibility	227:19,24	167:1,9 240:20	preamble 99:15 99:17	
210:21 211:3	229:16	potentially's	precipitous	
211:17	pointed 89:1	167:11	136:7 139:16 140:8	
plausible	114:25 115:1	powder 1:4	precipitously	
115:20	192:6 218:16	3:15 4:9 5:9 6:6	136:2,6	
play	points 131:17	9:10 40:18 43:3	precise 121:15	
played	policy 32:2,6,7	47:2 53:9 55:21	215:4	
please	pollution 158:6	70:16 79:9	precision	
10:8	population	83:21 94:21	120:21,21	
31:19 49:19	62:12 121:3,4,5	95:4,9 104:16	predict 71:13	
58:10 74:14	164:2	105:15 136:7	prefer 25:10	
77:25 78:11	populations	136:13,13,18	prejudiced	
95:16 105:2	226:13	136:20 137:5	131:14	
145:22 153:19	portion 26:15	138:19 139:13	premise 240:7	
154:2 205:1	position 43:4	139:15,22	preparations	
plug	237:14,25	140:4,16,20	43:24	
plyons	positive 126:10	141:15 142:11	prepare 13:5	
2:8	155:11,21	142:21 150:5	13:15,18,21	
point	156:23 157:7	150:15 151:10	216:15	
21:16	157:19 188:3	152:5,17 153:7	prepared 11:19	
43:9 44:25	possibility 29:4	153:15 155:12	preparing	
56:24 98:24	41:10 79:24	155:22 156:24	103:20,25	
99:22,23,25	136:24 239:10	159:20 160:14	preprint	
101:19 104:20	possible 79:13	167:4 188:4	162:18 163:19	
104:24 105:8	116:21 117:8	190:22 192:19	presence 29:15	
107:4 114:17	122:9 152:18	194:3,12 195:1	47:9	
114:24 116:1	168:2 214:12	207:7,13		
117:10,20	214:13 235:24	211:17 212:16		
118:3,15,18				
119:6,13				
120:19 124:16				

[present - published]

Page 39

present 60:7 210:10 221:2 222:6 presentation 163:25 presented 199:10 president 214:8 pretty 7:25 120:1 171:2,10 prevent 211:15 prevention 125:10 133:10 133:18 previous 11:5 79:3 132:15 167:2 previously 19:22 65:4 primary 212:21 principal 33:24 34:15 principle 71:8 print 175:9,10 printed 10:24 prior 13:5,9 15:17 47:22 133:14 152:19 239:16 241:6 priorities 34:14 35:3 priority 34:18 private 127:7 129:21 130:24 probability 121:18,22	probably 15:8 34:19,24 56:14 64:25 73:11 76:9 103:16 129:13 149:4,5 229:25 problem 7:22 7:23 79:1 108:7 108:8 109:17 128:14 161:21 221:1,8,9 problems 45:5 218:15 procedures 34:3 proceed 9:2 16:10 proceeding 206:18 process 14:1 228:19 proclaimed 137:9 produce 57:13 220:1,2,3 produced 12:14 15:17 49:1,7 50:9,19,25 57:23 83:21 140:13 216:7 product 5:16 165:20 168:9 168:15 173:21 products 1:4,5 3:16 47:6,7,17	48:10 49:12 50:10 53:19 54:11 55:1,2 56:4 70:17 83:21 136:22 137:10,21 140:6,19 174:19 177:6 216:8 231:17 133:13 207:25 244:5 professor 29:18 29:20,23 program 49:11 50:10 132:17 programming 125:1 pronounce 10:13 proper 93:9 97:18 properly 74:4 proponent 131:8 proportional 173:23 proposed 37:3 188:6 proposition 220:18 prospective 5:19 168:11,17 prospectively 167:5	protection 209:4 proves 220:18 provide 24:17 57:12 84:20,22 provided 16:13 42:17,18 53:6 54:2,12,15,20 55:12 83:18 professional 84:19 87:1 125:1,3 199:2 216:5 provides 82:1 187:2 211:2 providing 84:11 125:18 public 1:12 32:24 36:23 37:7,10,12 136:1 214:6,14 225:10 233:13 244:7 245:24 publication 6:13 168:5 177:25 209:20 227:19 228:13 publications 30:4 32:9 77:7 78:5,18,25 126:4 213:25 227:24 235:21 publish 29:13 33:15 34:8 published 18:2 30:13 32:18 34:10 35:7,9
--	--	--	--

[published - rate]

Page 40

	q		
	qualified 100:7	177:12 180:22 181:1 183:15 185:5 186:2,8,9 186:16,19 187:15,17 188:18 190:16 193:11 195:7 195:15 198:13 198:15 199:23 200:22 202:19 202:22 203:1 203:11,21 205:25 215:5 217:23,24 223:13 228:7 228:10 232:13 232:18 233:1 235:1 238:19 239:22 240:5,7 241:25	215:17,21 216:1,10 227:9 227:15 241:16 242:10
	qualifier 167:11	quick 52:25 227:8 241:17	
	quality 70:21 71:6,9 73:10 74:10 131:16 148:9 218:21 220:24	quickly 19:18 44:25	
	quantitative 6:10 204:12,16	quite 66:6 72:17 101:19 129:1 132:18 132:20 158:1 218:13 235:1	
	quebec 235:20 236:3	quote 47:17 146:11 147:11 227:21 228:15	
	question 14:14 14:25 19:11 25:3,20 28:2 31:13 37:6 39:12 46:20 50:7 60:10 66:2 68:22 69:2 71:18 73:6 74:8 74:9,13,16,17 75:11,13,15,18 78:2 79:16,18 79:19,21 80:1 80:14 83:11 90:1,11 98:15 99:18,19 100:12 101:11 102:6,8 117:15 135:19 139:25 140:9 141:6,7 141:11,12,20 146:9 147:14 158:12 165:18	r	
	questioning 103:2	r 2:1 244:1 245:1,1	
	questionnaire 34:4 72:17	rack 90:13	
	questions 34:5 45:10,25 46:6 46:12,19 72:16 74:2,15 78:12 79:3 102:16 104:7 135:16 164:5 173:16 178:19 180:24 182:16,18 207:19,20 208:22 209:1 211:11 213:4,8	rafferty 2:10	
		raise 8:20 39:16 153:24	
		ran 122:16	
		range 21:18 115:20 120:5 121:1,23 122:8 138:2,9 224:8 225:13	
		ranges 116:20 122:14,16,17 122:19	
		rarity 223:12	
		rate 73:2 135:4	

[rates - recognizes]

Page 41

rates	134:17 136:6 137:1 138:21 139:16 141:15	72:18 77:18,19 79:17 83:14 96:25 97:8 98:12 110:13	real 44:25 227:8	129:22,24 132:14 142:1
rather	93:11 113:14 157:5 157:16	111:6 124:7 137:17,19 140:14 143:12	realize 153:21 really 42:22 79:7 107:1	148:21,23 149:1 164:4,5,7 164:9,10,16
ratio	58:16,19 59:12 60:7 82:8 116:11 174:20 177:9 179:9,24 180:3 181:3,11 182:24 183:8 183:10 184:11 184:18 185:8 190:6 192:21 200:8 203:15	143:15 157:2 162:21 163:8 165:2 169:7,10 170:3,19,20 171:2,10,15,16 172:7 186:11 186:24 188:11 196:13 197:6 197:15,17 198:4,8,11	131:9 166:9,11 178:18 202:2 208:16 213:17 228:17	169:7,10 191:16 198:24 199:1,4 203:21 204:12,16 205:20 206:3,5
ratios	65:11,16 81:9,21 176:24 178:22 187:3 198:6 201:7,13	200:2,3,18,21 201:4 203:12 204:1 210:12 228:13 230:6	realtime 244:6 reason 57:3,3 70:5 91:13	208:20,25 215:4 228:17
rausa	206:21	230:21 231:7	107:25 109:8	229:2,7 230:5
raw	66:16	242:14 245:2	135:21 184:15	237:13,24
reach	37:12 56:9	reader 199:25	reasonable 138:10	238:25 239:4 239:11 240:9
reached	37:1,7 38:25 39:15,21 174:10 213:11 213:15 234:14	reading 51:10 51:12 53:13 74:3 77:11,15 77:22 87:11 111:12,25	13:12 21:11,11 30:23 31:4,8,23 32:1,22 33:1	240:10,17,25 241:5
reaching	48:21 154:10,18 213:5	125:8,15 130:5 149:6 152:11 171:21 188:8	48:7,15,15 51:10,12 52:19 63:20 65:9 69:15,16,18 72:20,24 76:9 79:19,20,21	recalled 164:14 165:4
read	16:18,19 18:3 38:21 40:21 53:20 56:2,7 61:14	reads 112:4,4 ready 10:6 36:14 208:7 218:6	88:20 89:10 92:21 93:17,23 93:25 94:1 97:17 100:24 103:13 104:8 104:10 125:25 126:25 129:18	recalls 31:16 received 22:16 97:4
				recent 44:14 54:23 212:3 recently 35:13 51:18 56:11
				103:17 163:20 171:2,10 208:23
				recognize 68:4 recognizes 210:9

[recollecting - remote]

Page 42

recollecting	56:3 126:5	74:16 79:6	163:13 164:16
126:10 217:4		87:12 97:4	165:6
recollection	216:3	123:8,17 207:2	reliance 15:21
14:6 21:7 44:16	referring 51:25	235:5 236:8	16:2,9,12 42:15
44:19,21 92:17	81:7 185:24	relates 59:15	170:25 171:5
104:19 107:17	187:6,7,10	140:7 141:15	relied 48:8
record 16:25	189:16 197:16	relation 75:10	177:15
17:3,5 18:4	198:23 200:4	relationship	rely 214:16
23:22 28:13	228:5	79:8 100:20	216:16,18
52:2,25 76:23	refers 20:20	104:15 106:4	218:24
82:12 96:4,21	227:20 228:10	210:20 211:16	relying 47:1,11
96:23 101:22	reflect 101:22	relative 59:22	47:13 56:6
111:19 124:1	111:20 124:2	59:24 60:7	remember 10:1
127:19 128:19	reflected 65:17	62:10 66:3,6,10	26:16 27:10
161:5 175:10	reflects 80:24	66:12 80:23	42:5 50:12
202:9,11,12,14	81:1	114:13 115:21	53:17 56:24
206:8 208:17	refresh 33:2	120:8,9,14	63:18 64:21
237:6,7 239:24	92:17 104:19	121:2,12,16,19	67:7 74:15
records 207:1,2	163:22	122:9,13	88:17 99:14
red 11:14	refusing 178:21	157:23,24	124:12 131:24
redirect 232:4	179:2	158:4,10 159:4	159:3,3 166:20
redline 11:18	regard 97:5	159:7 160:15	166:20 167:17
11:22 42:5	101:7 135:18	178:3,7 187:10	170:9,22
124:8	208:22 210:19	203:4 218:20	202:25 204:3
redlined 42:11	215:17 216:13	223:10 224:7	211:11 212:4
reduced 151:18	241:22	224:12,22,24	213:7 215:21
154:7,9	regarding 53:8	225:4,14	215:23 216:9
reevaluated	211:9 221:20	228:23	217:23,24
212:22	225:20	relatively 212:8	223:13 226:4
refer 47:16	registered	release 17:14	229:4 241:25
reference 9:14	244:5	relevant 32:17	remembering
160:24 214:22	regular 243:2	48:23 79:22	54:7
referenced	reinforces	143:24	remind 47:21
44:10	212:10	reliability 5:13	remote 1:8
references	related 4:22	161:9,16 162:4	45:18 153:22
44:17,20 53:14	32:3 62:20	162:12,15	197:3

[reorienting - result]

Page 43

reorienting	200:11 201:16	represented	researcher
98:22	212:3 218:2,5	216:12	213:19
repeat	222:18 225:16	reproduction	researchers
98:15 149:17	227:3,25	244:22	213:21 219:14
193:11	228:21 232:12	reproductive	resided
report	232:15 233:25	79:5 150:3,5,15	resituate
9:23 10:21 11:3	reported 5:13	150:22 152:4	238:1
11:5,12,16	113:21 161:10	153:6,15 154:6	respect
15:23 16:5	161:16 162:4	154:11,16,22	134:9 165:12
17:13,19,20	162:15 163:13	155:14,24	180:22
27:10 37:3	184:13,19	157:1 159:8,14	respected
41:23 42:1,9,10	185:20 188:14	159:20 191:9	134:10
47:14,15,24	188:16 190:7	203:5	respond
48:3,9 49:18	191:14 195:11	reputations	responded
51:5,9,11,16,19	197:1,23	126:2	74:21 144:14
51:21,23 52:1	198:21 201:13	request	responding
52:10 54:16	203:14 214:24	8:22	130:9,25
60:12 65:22,23	reporter 1:11	130:25	responds
65:24 84:20,22	8:19 9:1 18:12	require	51:6
85:1 88:10 89:3	94:9 202:6,10	115:3	response
89:8 90:15 97:6	242:19,22	229:3	51:20
101:11,12	243:1 244:5,6,6	required	74:16,23
102:12,18,20	244:25	136:15	100:20 104:11
103:1 105:24	reporting	requires	104:15 105:14
106:2,8,9,12,16	165:19,24	220:20	106:3,20
106:24 107:6	166:17 167:25	226:25	147:15 179:5
107:15 124:9	reports 42:22	research	responsibility
124:10 126:5	47:13 51:12,13	29:13	214:5
129:4,7,10,20	51:14 52:5,12	33:19,20,22	responsible
129:23 141:25	52:17 87:7	37:13 38:23	211:4
145:14,25	110:19 111:9	60:25 126:8	rest
146:7,10 149:4	111:14 124:7	129:16,21	231:7
150:2,11 153:4	196:20 200:7	134:12,12	restate
153:10 167:14	224:2	137:17,18	238:18
167:23 168:4,6	representation	143:16 152:23	restated
170:13 186:22	78:10 215:9	214:3,12,13	60:3,4
		222:2 233:20	238:20
		234:1,5,6	result
		235:17	66:8,19

[resulting - robust]

Page 44

resulting	218:11 219:7	142:16 145:20	138:13,13
218:13	221:7 223:24	156:1,7 157:2,8	151:18 154:7,9
results	223:25 225:18	159:22 164:21	157:6 158:10
98:19 99:4	237:2	164:25 165:1	158:18 159:4,7
100:23 172:3	reviewed 16:1	169:12 172:14	160:15,15,16
187:8,13	16:4 48:25 49:9	176:23 179:14	160:25 170:13
188:19,20	50:8 51:5,16	183:22,25	178:3,7,22
191:7,17,21,24	52:4,18,19	184:13,16	184:11,18
192:7,8 195:17	65:10 80:8	186:5,22 187:4	185:8 187:3
195:20 197:16	175:2 235:13	194:21 195:4	190:6 191:14
198:16 199:9	236:11	195:22 201:23	194:4,13 195:1
199:14 200:24	reviewers 36:4	203:8,14	198:6,20 199:2
205:21 213:17	reviewing	208:10 210:14	201:6 203:3,4
219:23 220:22	50:12 100:24	211:13 216:14	207:9 218:20
220:25 221:10	171:23	218:4 227:5	223:10,11
226:12	reviews 211:22	238:4,14	224:5,5,7,11,19
retained	rgolomb 2:18	239:17	224:19,22,24
26:25	richard 2:16	rigorous 230:3	225:2,4,9,12,14
27:6,17,24 28:3	7:5,7,9	ring 38:10 52:8	226:17 236:6
28:16,25 93:20	right 9:18 10:2	risk 4:7,9,16,21	risks 80:23
93:21	10:3 15:7 16:24	6:7 37:20 38:24	115:21 121:2
retire 24:3	20:2,12 23:1,9	40:1,5 58:16,19	122:9 132:1
retired 24:2	27:16 48:15	59:12,13,22,24	150:6,16,23
retrospectively	57:6,7 58:2,17	60:2,7,8 61:22	152:6 153:7,16
167:4	61:8 68:2,8,8	62:10,14 65:11	154:15,23
revenue 23:7	76:21 80:1	65:16 66:3,7,10	155:2 157:23
24:12	82:11,15 85:8	66:13 81:9,20	157:24 158:4
review 3:17 5:6	87:9 89:19	82:1,8 91:4,25	159:21 187:11
13:4 15:21	91:14 94:12,14	94:21 95:4,10	211:4,5 224:7
51:19 62:19	100:20 106:17	104:17 105:15	224:12,24
70:18 127:23	106:20 108:25	108:10,16	228:23 235:19
128:4 171:18	109:16 111:3	114:7,13 120:8	236:2
171:20 177:14	112:18 113:24	120:9,14	rls 1:2
191:19 211:9	117:15 124:7	121:13,17,19	road 2:6
211:14 212:11	125:18 128:1	121:21 122:14	robust 49:2,10
212:13 215:20	133:23 136:2	123:7,16 138:4	50:9
217:21 218:9			

[role - seeing]

Page 45

role	20:16 28:6	120:2 122:12	scream	176:25	sections	201:19
room	7:11 8:5,7	129:22,24	screen	69:22	secured	16:15
rough	242:17	137:4 139:8	85:20 86:10,13		see	7:24 8:2
roughly	52:13	157:5 166:25	86:15,22 90:8			18:7 32:16,16
	140:23	191:10 240:12	91:8,20 96:19			40:1 41:2 45:1
roughs	242:18	says	98:10,11			47:14 72:18
rpr	244:14	16:7 45:7	105:10 111:6			77:8,14 78:3,6
rrs	9:15	83:1,17 87:5,23	97:1,3 110:13			78:14,16,16
rule	53:20	110:17,19	145:23 161:22			80:20 86:9
rullo	143:18	111:14 124:25	164:23 169:18			92:19 97:14
running	94:12	150:14,21	172:22 173:12			98:18 105:17
	163:1	151:9,15,24	173:19 179:16			109:5 110:18
s		152:2,11	196:9 204:23			110:23 111:17
s	2:1 3:11 4:3	154:11 155:3	205:5 209:12			114:15 116:19
	5:3 6:3 8:23	179:14,23	scribbles	12:8		117:18 123:21
	245:1	192:18 210:7	12:14			124:20,24
s4	5:21 172:14	230:25	script	74:22		125:5 132:14
	172:16,25	scale	195:21,24			143:20,22
	173:2,8,11,18	70:25	sean	3:18 70:18		144:2,3 145:12
	176:16	71:18 73:17	search	230:1,2		146:16,17
sales	1:4	scales	196:18	searching		148:18 150:7
sample	120:9	scattered	211:25			150:17,19
	120:16 121:10	10:21	second	4:13		160:7,17,18,20
	121:12,15	scientific	94:19 106:12			160:22 162:16
	122:8	48:22	108:20 123:23			162:18 174:4
sanchez	52:5,7	111:25 131:8	145:24 156:11			174:21 175:7
	52:17	213:6,13,25,25	165:1 168:24			175:24 179:25
savant	19:1,2	214:18,22	185:1 193:6			180:1 188:17
saw	54:15	215:3	202:7			188:19,20
	132:4 177:21	scientifically	seconds	118:6		191:22 192:1
saying	11:7	224:15	227:7			196:10,10
	22:4,14 74:20	scientist	section	9:8		199:11,13
	93:23 115:7,15	43:20	102:12 147:18			227:8 231:3,4
	118:10,12,14	48:21 233:17	147:19 151:9		seeing	109:14
	118:19 119:25	233:18	156:4 167:22			126:25 175:14
		scientists	222:25 223:1			206:3
		43:23				
		127:12 214:15				
		214:23				
		score				
		71:23				

[seen - siemiatycki]

Page 46

seen	15:12 36:16,17 41:20 43:8 61:16 76:6 140:15,17 169:13 205:12 205:24 206:2 212:3 214:20 229:8	193:2 196:23 223:5 231:9,12 231:15	235:4 share 60:20 176:4,5 210:2 sentences 151:21 201:19 separately 199:14 september 30:6 30:13,19 32:20	shriek 50:4 sic 162:21 side 93:21 97:11,20 112:18 125:16 126:13
self	5:13 130:23 161:10,16 162:4,12,15 163:13	152:16 155:5	shared 85:24 234:19,20	siemiatycki 1:9 3:4,22 4:14 7:12,14 9:17
seminary	2:6	sequence 79:11	shaving 176:25 177:7 180:10	10:11 12:2,6 13:4 14:12 16:7 19:24 22:13
send	12:25	sequitur 75:11	shift 137:20 shorten 44:24	24:20 25:12
senior	63:21 64:6	series 208:25	shorthand 119:11 show 14:8 83:6	31:8,23 45:24 46:5,11,18,25 48:6,19,25
sense	20:7 21:13 65:5 122:18 151:15 154:5	71:14 71:15	116:22 117:3 146:18 147:20	49:21 50:6 52:4 53:5 56:1,9 58:15 61:13
sensitive	5:17 168:10,16	seriously 218:14	150:20 153:5 serve 127:7,13	70:3 74:7,18 75:1,3 79:15
sent	15:19 16:15 42:23,24 95:21 169:23 215:19	216:6	153:14 154:21 155:1 156:2 served 28:6	83:22 84:17 85:16 89:24
sentence	9:14 47:23 48:3 77:13,19 78:6 78:14,16 79:2 88:6 111:12,13 147:11,17 149:10 151:22 151:23,24	services 57:11 83:18 84:11	182:8 187:5 191:20 209:3 serving 145:2	99:2 101:6,17 103:8,11
	152:2 154:10 165:1,9 167:12	216:6	216:2 219:8 set 171:25	106:13 113:13
		seven 81:20	showed 178:3,6 179:22	113:20 128:11
		several 23:4 25:14,25 26:6	showing 116:11 175:5 178:13	128:24 134:16
		27:18 81:19	191:7	141:10 142:23
		174:19 199:8	shown 14:14 157:24 210:8	145:2 157:3
		201:18 208:21	210:17 225:3	159:18 162:24
		215:16 224:1	231:1	163:8 164:11
		228:22	shows 42:6	166:14 171:7
		sgo 39:6 213:5	181:20,21	177:6 178:21
		213:11 214:17	182:4 219:11	181:10 182:22
		234:15,21	226:22	183:1,7 184:10

[siemiatycki - sort]

Page 47

185:7 186:15	significantly	slate 2:21	41:24 44:18
189:15 190:5	118:20 134:17	slightly 122:3	59:3 65:14
196:6 202:25	134:22 183:22	small 98:12	66:22 67:10
204:10 205:13	similar 27:13	119:14 120:16	69:10 70:1,6
205:16 206:15	66:17 137:23	120:17 155:11	71:3 72:22
208:20 210:5	simple 45:24	155:21 156:23	76:25 77:10,10
211:7 215:5	46:5,12 90:11	157:7,10,16,18	84:5 86:4 87:10
227:18 237:10	181:1 188:18	158:14 188:3	88:15 89:13
238:22 239:20	simpler 238:23	219:22,22	93:1 94:7,9
240:14 241:21	simplistic 71:11	smaller 157:24	95:2,21 97:2
243:6	simply 70:7	society 37:25	98:8,11,18
siemiatycki's	single 138:2	38:14,16 39:4	102:13 103:6
9:6 102:7	173:21 229:7	39:11 40:12,15	104:22,23
128:17 145:24	sister 5:18	40:24 215:7,9	109:19,21
sign 242:14	163:24 168:11	soft 107:11	110:10 112:20
signature	168:17 177:24	sogc 38:2,4	115:23 119:7,9
244:12 245:19	178:1,4,6,17	sold 83:21	119:20 123:25
significance	184:12,19,19	216:8	128:13,23
100:13 210:15	sitting 15:9	solicitation	130:16 134:25
210:18 218:25	23:14,20 26:16	131:10	137:11 139:5
219:16,17	32:12 48:6 68:3	solicited 130:7	146:3,3 149:15
220:8	72:20,23	solid 138:9	149:16 155:16
significant 98:6	141:12 190:6	somebody	156:2,17
99:25 100:1,7	199:4	59:10 229:1	161:13,19
104:17 116:25	six 81:20 88:20	someone's	162:25 163:2
117:4 118:9,13	190:18 206:16	28:18,19	166:10 169:2,8
118:22 177:10	sixth 80:18	somewhat	170:20 173:3
178:23 179:11	size 120:19	158:10	174:7 185:13
180:4,16 181:2	skadden 2:21	soon 194:16	186:12 195:12
181:11,15	skadden.com	sophisticated	197:6 198:25
183:9,11	2:24,25	219:13	205:17 227:23
184:20 219:3,8	skeptical 71:8	sophistication	234:25 237:15
219:24 220:4,6	skim 201:1	220:20	238:1 239:23
225:19,21,25	skimmed	sorry 11:6	sort 11:4 12:12
226:3,19	103:16	13:16 18:5,12	29:12 32:6
		21:10 33:14	34:17 35:15

[sort - stenographic]

Page 48

42:11 48:21	specification	started 10:7	states 1:1 9:14
53:21 57:17	80:18	34:19 35:1	39:5 121:5
62:9 103:14	specifications	36:10,13 117:7	134:9
113:24 116:10	81:21	153:19 225:6	stating 239:22
117:17 119:18	specifics 148:7	235:18	statistical
131:24 138:17	specify 231:5,9	starting 8:16	100:13 116:22
152:24 216:24	231:11,12,15	163:19 202:23	119:5 120:19
221:8	speculate 117:8	starts 89:21	122:4 125:1
sought 234:21	speculated	156:14 223:5	212:1 218:25
sound 20:2	139:12 140:1	state 1:12 7:8	219:16,17
168:25 169:3	speculating	20:14,16,21	220:8
sounds 20:11	138:22 139:3	21:1 77:5 78:3	statistically
61:15	speculation	148:13,14,24	98:6 99:24
source 24:21	139:9,18,20	155:21 160:12	100:1,6 114:22
sources 24:12	speeches	164:13 192:11	117:4 118:9,13
25:9 43:21	182:16	244:7 245:25	118:19,22
241:12	spend 48:16	stated 34:15	177:10 178:23
south 2:11	74:2	40:15 44:11	179:10 180:4
span 226:15,16	spoke 139:5	104:14 144:25	180:16 181:2
spanish 110:4	233:16	216:4 225:16	181:11,14
spans 223:1	spoken 89:5	240:8	183:9,11
speak 57:14	125:22	statement	184:20 219:2,8
89:6 213:11	sponsored	40:21 41:10,11	219:24 226:19
233:13,14	144:5	49:18 68:18	statisticians
specific 149:10	spot 109:16	83:13 85:5	219:13
198:9,10	stage 138:13,13	87:15 92:18	status 121:8
206:17 207:13	standalone	94:3 97:1 109:7	152:21 164:16
239:5 241:3	12:11	122:1 147:24	165:6 167:4
specifically	standing 182:1	155:6 164:17	stayed 217:16
69:18 132:4	stands 228:8	165:7,10	steam 163:1
195:17 197:19	starch 137:13	187:23 210:15	steering 7:3
209:6 210:6	137:13,21	210:19 216:17	stenographer
215:6 216:1,3	start 26:3 76:3	223:17,18	79:17
217:20 218:1	76:7 77:22	statements	stenographic
222:24	179:8 229:24	32:24 149:1	244:10
		180:19	

[steps - sure]

Page 49

steps	77:22	74:11 76:6 80:2	168:17 177:24	substantial
stick	141:11	80:6,9 82:4	178:1,4,6,17	26:15
stimulus	53:21	120:17 146:13	184:12,19	substituted
stop	49:19,22	146:15 147:7	187:8,14	9:22
stopped	84:10	147:12,24,25	191:17,21	subsumed
stotz	1:10 244:4 244:14	148:5,6,13,15 148:18,22,24	218:10 220:19 220:21,23	122:20 221:4,5 suggest 102:21 115:9
strain	174:17	149:8,9,13,21	221:2 236:1	suggesting
strategy	45:13	149:22 151:25	studying	130:1
street	2:11,16	152:3,13	235:19	suggests 156:22 188:2
strength	225:21 226:1,10	154:21,24 155:1 156:22	subject 207:18 subjective	suite 2:6,16
strengths	147:6 147:20 220:19 220:21	156:22 167:3 167:25 188:2,2 205:22 213:19	117:17 131:15 157:16 158:10 221:16	summarized 71:7
strictly	32:7 122:2	218:21 219:1,2 219:7,16,19,22	subjects 178:15 219:23	summary 190:23 222:20
strong	132:17 132:20 158:1 224:14,16 225:3 226:24 227:21 228:4 228:15 229:2 229:14	219:25 220:3 220:14,15 221:3,5,15 226:12,18 240:9,11 241:2 241:3	submission 36:15 submit 36:8 submitted 16:4 21:8 51:20 53:15 57:13	summer 217:4 superior 69:4 147:25 148:6 220:15
strongly	225:14	study 5:18 33:9	82:16 83:3,4,8	supplemental 5:21 17:20 84:20,21 173:1
stuck	172:13	33:16,23 34:2	88:11,13 89:4,8	173:8
stud	107:19	34:21 35:9 68:4	90:15	support 40:16
student	236:1	69:5 71:22,25	subpoenaed	41:5,12 55:4
students	29:12 35:4	72:6,12,15	235:4	125:1 215:12
studies	33:5 61:21 65:2 66:1 66:20,23 67:19 68:25 71:6,10 71:12 72:8 73:13,15,19,22	73:23,24,25 74:10,11 75:7 75:21 76:4 78:22 92:7,9,11 143:15 147:3 148:8,8 150:24 151:1 163:24 165:11 168:11	subscribed 245:21 subsequent 225:8 subsets 178:16 substances 137:22 236:25	222:4 supported 225:15 supposed 14:2 14:24 sure 7:19 11:6 11:14 15:15 16:15 17:12

[sure - talc]

Page 50

18:6 20:20,24 28:9 32:5 38:16 49:5 53:10 54:13 58:11,12 60:16 72:17 73:24 77:1 79:9 82:3 83:5 87:1 87:10 108:22 113:17 115:5 118:11 124:20 124:20 126:11 131:20,23 132:3 139:6 147:2 190:20 196:16 198:17 199:9 205:2 209:16 217:2 225:23 227:7 227:11 surgery 79:10 surgical 154:13 158:24 surprise 69:19 133:20 229:11 229:18,19 230:4 surprised 38:17 38:19 127:11 127:17 133:2 susan 143:17 144:4,9 suspect 130:22 suzanne 1:10 186:11 202:4,8 242:13 244:4 244:14	switch 192:17 208:14,15 switched 192:15 sworn 8:24 245:21 system 216:22 systematic 3:16 62:19 70:17 211:9,14 223:25 225:18 systems 150:3,5 150:15,22 152:4 153:6,16 154:6,12,17,22 159:20 t t 3:11 4:3 5:3 6:3 8:23 244:1 244:1 245:1,1 table 5:21 9:15 65:23,24 67:13 68:16 69:22 70:12,13,22 72:11 76:22 78:18 80:3,17 81:16 89:15,16 89:24 90:2,7,9 90:19,21 97:23 98:3,9,24 100:22 112:12 112:16 113:5 113:25 151:7 172:14,16,25 173:2,8,11,18	175:20 176:16 176:17 177:18 177:20 182:8,8 182:11 183:8 183:22 185:15 185:23 186:18 187:5,7,9 195:17,19 198:10 199:17 199:21 200:5 201:25 203:23 tables 106:17 106:19 107:15 108:1 196:11 201:7 take 12:24 23:12,21 53:1 95:25 101:14 123:13 124:11 134:13 146:21 163:21 168:23 184:6 197:17 198:3,5,19 201:12 210:23 218:13 236:7 242:24 taken 1:9,13 53:3 82:13 127:20 156:14 156:20 161:6 187:25 206:13 227:13 237:8 takes 34:21 talc 3:23 4:21 5:6,8,12 6:11 9:10 20:1,17,19	21:15 22:21 23:4,11 24:9,22 25:13,23 26:4 26:14,17 27:17 27:19 30:5,21 31:10,25 32:3,9 32:20,25 33:5,8 33:16 34:6 35:10 36:19,24 37:8,19 39:1,16 39:22 40:1,5,18 43:11,24,24 44:11,17,20,22 47:6,7,17 48:10 49:2,11 50:10 50:21 53:19 54:11,24,25 55:2,4,21 56:4 56:6,11,17 58:17,20,24 59:1,11,15 61:23 62:16 75:8,23 76:3,8 79:6,13,13 80:19 81:9,17 81:21 85:17 87:13,24 93:2,5 93:11,12 97:5 123:6,16 126:4 127:23 128:4 137:10,21,23 140:6 142:11 142:21 144:6 145:10 149:23 151:20 152:4 152:18,20
--	---	--	---

[talc - thank]

Page 51

154:9 157:21	141:15 150:5	teams 226:14	terry 67:8,8,12
157:25 159:1,5	150:15 152:5	technically	test 100:18
161:8,15 162:3	153:6,15	62:1 157:11	117:3,6,18,19
162:10,14	159:20 207:6	tell 14:2 23:14	117:20 118:4,7
163:14 164:1	207:13 211:17	46:22 56:21	222:21
165:24 166:17	212:16 215:10	63:14 64:6	testified 8:25
170:14 177:2,2	215:12,20	78:17 96:19	20:25 43:1 87:9
177:3,8,8 178:2	216:8 223:23	104:13 118:8	97:11,18 175:1
180:10,11	225:17	178:22 179:2	177:13 181:24
181:21 182:5	talk 15:14 79:4	190:5 196:19	191:12 195:6
182:24 183:11	153:19 182:14	196:24 200:6	233:12 237:10
183:20 188:7	189:9	201:12,25	237:23 238:13
190:22 197:23	talked 14:3	213:16 218:6	testify 232:20
204:12,17	28:18 205:4	telling 45:20	233:4,9
205:21 210:7,8	talking 22:3	48:2 121:17	testifying 93:17
210:10,16,17	48:1 51:22	122:7 173:17	238:16
210:21 211:1	60:16 100:14	tells 121:14	testimony 43:6
212:17,19,21	111:10 140:2	temper 102:24	48:13 55:7 84:3
212:25 213:2	145:21 153:18	103:6	84:6 100:16
217:21 218:11	153:23 166:2,5	temporal 79:8	107:24 110:20
222:5,19 224:9	185:14,15,18	79:11 152:15	111:15 125:2,3
225:13 228:6	186:13 187:10	155:5	125:18 172:5
228:11 230:25	188:21,23	ten 33:22 63:17	201:9 206:16
231:1,13,14,24	189:4,5,7	80:2	239:17 245:2
232:21,25	190:20 192:16	tend 153:5	testing 49:2,11
233:5 235:5	193:4 194:11	154:21 155:1	50:9,21 51:7
236:24 237:3	200:25 201:2	221:21	tests 116:22
238:4,17	224:8 231:13	tenor 46:18	text 86:20
241:23 242:8	231:17	term 100:6	thank 8:2 9:1
talcum 1:4 3:15	tally 42:20	117:16 128:1	10:4,8 21:4
70:16 83:21	220:20	141:3	46:23 53:2
136:7,13,13,18	tallying 219:1	terminology	55:15 61:19
136:20 137:5	taught 133:6	225:7	76:1 80:14
138:19 139:13	team 178:5	terms 60:9	90:24 95:2
139:15,22	211:24 235:18	157:10,14	96:22 97:22
140:4,16,19		200:7 224:14	99:8,16 100:5

[thank - together]

Page 52

100:10 105:4	56:23 57:18	186:6,17,19	81:2,6,10
107:8 111:21	65:24 66:9 67:3	thoughts 238:2	190:18 234:15
113:10 122:22	67:6 72:10,13	thousand 23:16	timing 51:9
122:24 129:2	74:9,12,25	201:18	79:22
141:23 149:25	75:16 79:4	thousands	tisi 2:11 7:2
161:4 169:20	84:14 90:6	50:20 51:1	13:15,18 95:18
176:18 183:19	94:10 109:11	three 16:13	95:23 96:2,5,8
184:7 185:3	117:7 120:25	20:10 36:2	96:11,14,18,22
206:11 208:1,3	121:24 122:7	80:17 87:6,24	108:20,24
208:6 209:9,23	122:22 124:19	88:4 104:4	109:4 162:7,11
210:3 227:12	124:24 126:7	112:22 170:5	162:16 175:6
227:14 230:19	128:1 131:23	201:17 206:8	175:11,14,18
242:14,22,25	136:4 137:8,19	threefold 111:8	175:24 184:25
thanks 156:9	138:2 139:14	time 13:20	185:3 188:22
190:2	140:6,12	21:11 23:21	189:6,12,16,20
theirs 66:9	147:14,17	24:1 27:1,1	189:23 190:1
theme 79:20	151:3,22	33:25 35:17	title 164:6
theories 131:9	163:10 167:20	42:20 45:17,23	titled 173:12
theorizing	169:14 171:16	46:14 71:13	titus 123:19
115:3	171:17 177:21	75:4,6,21,23	tobacco 224:21
thing 38:18	188:21 190:11	78:15 83:9 84:8	today 10:18
130:18 157:17	192:5 203:2	84:9 88:6 89:8	13:6 14:20
179:12 218:22	205:14 207:24	95:25 101:1	15:10 23:15
225:5 226:20	216:20 217:1	103:12 107:21	25:21 26:16
things 79:8	224:3 227:9	123:13 129:15	31:19 32:12
114:12 191:25	228:7 235:16	135:23 136:12	42:16 48:7
213:22 216:24	239:2,9 240:6	140:18 148:21	52:22 53:23
217:5	240:19 241:12	197:3,5 200:18	72:21,23 84:3,6
think 10:25	thinking 133:1	202:4,5 207:20	103:5 110:16
12:14 13:23	133:20	208:2 211:7	141:13 149:24
15:8,24 17:11	third 17:20	216:24 217:8	199:5 206:16
17:14 19:18	78:15 91:25	225:2 227:15	208:2 237:25
20:11 22:13	111:1 221:1	230:17 240:13	together 12:19
23:9 26:21 27:9	thorough 230:3	times 60:2	140:7 156:15
27:9 29:8 33:3	thought 56:17	64:18 65:13,18	156:21 187:25
35:8 44:15 54:5	72:5 154:3	67:25 80:25	219:25 226:21

[told - under]

Page 53

told 56:23 68:3 107:5	transmission 215:2	162:7 184:25 185:25 189:7	115:15,21 116:3,13,19
took 23:21 130:19 191:21	transport 221:20 222:3	189:20,20,23 201:11 238:1	117:5,22,23,24 118:5 119:5,13
tool 71:11,11	transported 222:11	239:5	120:2 122:17
top 38:10 69:13 88:19 160:12 179:17,19 223:2	trend 219:11 trends 105:14 136:12	tubal 76:13 151:11 152:16 152:19	122:19 148:17 148:22,23 159:16 203:22 204:6 229:15 229:16
topic 44:14 53:18,18 65:25 138:25 152:24 172:11 211:22 221:8 241:4,23	trial 206:18 232:21 233:4	tubes 75:4,6,8 75:22,24 77:6	type 148:7
topics 172:11 213:20 214:12	triangle 126:9	78:5,19,24 79:5	types 9:11 147:21
total 20:15,19 21:15 22:5,21 23:7,11 51:3 121:3,4	triggered 160:8	80:4,12 151:18 185:9,10,21,22	typically 35:4 64:24 233:13
touch 38:21	trouble 54:7	192:23	u
toward 140:4	true 115:21	tumors 17:8 138:9	u 30:11
towns 236:2	120:8 121:1,12	tung 4:18 108:12	u.s. 5:18 43:22 168:11,17
track 94:13	121:16,18,21	turn 68:16	uh 17:10 42:3 89:21 119:24
tract 4:23 79:6 123:8,17	122:9,13,16 136:3 148:1 149:19 167:9	76:22 91:16 95:16 97:23	146:23 147:4,8 151:6,8 167:16 196:25 199:16 202:17
tracts 155:14 155:24 157:1 159:8,14 191:9 203:5	180:9 217:18 244:9 245:3	112:17 145:13	umbrella 148:10
transcript 6:18 244:9,22 245:3	truths 148:5	172:14 177:1	unable 152:15 155:4
translates 160:16 223:11	try 69:14 74:14 107:22 141:10 195:18 198:12	202:14 205:17 206:10 207:21 209:7,10 218:4	unaware 133:16 144:10 145:11
translocation 222:3	200:19	222:25	uncited 48:9
	trying 24:13 48:14 65:4 69:2	turned 59:12 two 13:5,9,24	under 36:6 87:12 99:20
	75:17 78:1	14:4 17:1 21:23	
	79:21 90:12	51:24 64:18	
	115:17 117:10	65:13,18 66:14	
	120:12 142:25	66:21 67:25	
	147:15 148:2	77:22 80:17,25	
	152:7 153:9,12	81:2,6,10	
	158:13,19	114:24 115:7	

[under - value]

Page 54

148:9 244:23	unedited 91:16	141:3,16	219:5,6 229:8
underarm	unfair 78:9	151:10,20	useful 56:18
177:2,8 180:10	united 1:1 39:5	152:17,21	176:19
underlying	121:5 134:9	155:12,22	user 59:11,25
115:21 120:8	units 81:5	156:24 157:18	60:2
121:1,12,16,18	university 24:2	158:9,14	users 60:6
121:21 122:9	29:10,14,19,21	160:14 161:8,9	66:11
160:13 188:5	29:24 30:1	161:15,16	uses 17:16
223:6,8	35:14	162:3,3,10,14	210:10 229:14
understand	unreliable	162:14 163:12	using 71:10
11:7 24:14,18	221:16	163:14 164:1	76:3,7 92:6
33:14 47:25	unsong 218:20	164:14 165:3	173:22 218:25
59:8,9 75:13,18	unstable	165:12,12,20	226:4 229:2
79:11,12 90:12	119:13	165:24 166:17	usually 7:20
95:23 96:11	updated 16:2	168:8,14	76:18 81:25
100:16 115:6	212:5	170:14 173:21	107:12
118:11 119:12	upper 114:16	178:2 183:21	uteri 151:16
145:7 153:9,12	ups 221:6	183:23 188:4	uterine 173:22
158:12 175:4	usage 140:16	192:19 194:3	
177:17 178:15	207:6	194:12 195:1	v
180:21 181:8	use 3:15 4:9,21	197:23 207:13	v 2:11
181:25 198:14	5:12,13,15 6:6	210:25 219:9	vacation 105:1
198:18 201:11	36:24 37:8,20	223:9 230:7	vaginal 177:2,8
201:24 208:5	58:17,20 59:1	used 58:23 62:2	180:11 181:21
216:22 235:1	61:23 64:19	65:1,12,16 66:1	182:5 183:10
238:16 239:21	65:7,13,18	66:3,7 67:18,21	183:20
239:22	67:17,25 68:14	68:7,8,11,12,14	vaguely 169:5
understanding	69:3 70:16	68:24 69:1,4	valid 146:14
35:11 73:21	71:20 80:24	71:2,4,19 72:6	147:12 180:19
79:23 217:6	81:2,9,17 82:8	72:8,11,12 75:8	validity 73:10
understood	94:21 95:4,9	75:23 79:9	131:16 132:6
109:2,3	104:16 105:15	80:23 99:15	149:7 220:15
undertake 53:7	117:16 119:10	150:3,5,15	220:24
undertaken	123:6,16 130:4	152:5,19 153:6	value 9:16
53:11	136:8,13,18	153:14 158:15	122:16
	138:19 139:22	159:20 183:23	

[variability - winded]

Page 55

variability	volume 171:24	79:25 119:1,2,4	went 74:21
116:24 117:22	volunteer 56:16	120:23 126:16	77:2 187:20
variable 82:3	w	129:13 130:8	202:20,21
variables 64:22	wait 68:17	130:13 152:14	wentzensen
various 47:7	94:23,23 95:19	167:21 172:13	125:23 145:15
53:13 74:11	108:20 229:22	174:4,5 213:13	145:19 149:11
120:22 131:25	229:22 232:14	213:24 219:20	149:20 150:21
132:2 163:25	waiting 12:15	225:8 230:3	150:24 151:1
venture 177:20	105:7 186:1	232:21,24,25	152:11 153:13
verbal 115:14	want 7:24 8:2	233:2,11	154:25 155:7
verifications	19:13 61:6,9,10	ways 66:18	156:6 160:12
216:25	61:12 77:17	138:15	162:21 184:5
verifying 67:10	85:10 86:14	we've 185:18	184:24 185:17
version 11:3,5	101:14 108:21	192:13,16	186:22 187:14
42:12 90:5	108:22,23	weak 160:15	188:24,25
113:12,14	109:6 110:1	223:10,19	190:20,22
146:24 163:19	113:12 119:17	224:14,17	192:3 203:13
versions 109:21	123:13 140:24	weaknesses	222:19
versus 99:10	141:5,7 160:19	147:6,21	west 2:23 8:14
147:7 167:4	170:17 174:23	220:19,21	8:15
185:9 190:8	175:9,9 176:3,5	web 109:10	when's 101:1
197:25 199:2	176:21 182:13	website 37:22	white 98:5,17
200:8 231:13	182:19 188:8	websites 214:25	99:3,12,21,25
videoconfere...	190:3 195:16	wednesday	105:16
2:4,10,15,21	195:16 197:6	1:13	who've 206:17
view 130:7	197:14,18	week 64:18	wide 5:18
131:15,17	198:17 199:21	65:13,18 67:25	119:21,25
views 32:18	199:23 207:21	80:25 81:2,6,11	120:1 168:11
virginia 2:6	208:1 240:14	weeks 13:23	168:17
visible 179:20	242:15,16	weight 40:15	widely 140:22
vitonis 123:19	wanted 10:23	41:12	width 120:24
124:25 125:17	204:10	weighted 73:17	william 47:5
vocabulary	watch 102:3	weird 110:3	123:19
137:12	way 9:23 37:18	welch 123:19	win 101:15
voice 107:11	60:6,8 73:20	winded 46:12	
153:25			

[wish - work]

Page 56

wish 9:24	136:10 138:24	245:19	191:8,15,18
222:13	139:5,20	witnesses	192:22 195:10
witness 8:21	140:12 141:19	126:13 189:5	195:10 196:21
13:11 14:17	143:5 144:10	woman 58:23	197:25,25
17:6,18 18:5	144:18 145:18	59:25 74:18	199:2,3,15
19:1,17 21:10	146:6 147:16	75:3,5,20 92:4	200:8 203:5,5
23:19 25:8,16	149:15 150:24	203:15	203:17 207:13
26:8,12,23 27:3	151:2 152:10	woman's 59:14	226:14 236:2
27:22 28:9 31:1	154:1,4 155:18	women 4:11,17	women's 61:21
34:13 36:19	157:10 158:22	27:14 69:17	143:16 152:20
38:6,8 40:8,20	160:6 161:3	76:3,7,13 77:6	210:25
41:2,16 43:7	163:18 168:20	78:4,19,23 79:9	wondering
46:23 48:14	169:16 170:9	80:3,10 92:14	237:25
49:5 50:12,24	170:19 171:13	95:5,11 98:3,16	woolen 3:18
54:5 55:8 56:2	177:19 178:25	98:17,20 99:3,3	58:16,19 59:12
59:3,18 61:16	180:7,13,18	99:9,12,20,21	63:6,9,21,22
62:1,9 63:3,25	181:14 182:7	99:24 100:1	64:9,17 65:11
64:5,14 67:6	183:17 184:2	105:16,16	65:17,21 66:4
68:2,10,19,24	185:13 186:1	108:11,17	66:13 67:18
70:9,21 71:25	187:16,18	115:22,23,24	68:7 69:9,11,12
73:5 75:10,17	188:25 191:6	115:24 116:11	69:22 70:19
76:20,25 77:17	194:9 196:16	120:10,15	71:22 76:24
78:8 81:13,24	197:14 200:16	121:6,19	78:21 80:24
83:25 84:14	200:24 202:16	122:13 136:18	82:7
87:18 88:4	202:18 203:20	140:2 150:2,4	woolen's 73:2
91:11 93:14	205:7 207:16	150:14,21	word 99:15
94:16 97:14	208:6 227:23	151:16 152:3	124:11 158:8
100:3 105:7,21	228:9,17	153:5,14 154:5	158:14,16
107:7 111:22	229:18,24	154:21 155:13	167:12 226:5
112:6,9 114:10	231:21 232:16	155:23 156:25	229:2,14 240:6
123:24 125:13	232:24 233:23	158:24 159:8,9	words 39:9
125:20 126:16	234:1,11,17,25	159:13,16,19	92:13 137:12
126:22 127:16	236:22 237:15	163:14 185:9,9	157:18 201:18
128:8 130:12	237:17 238:11	185:20,21	229:8
132:20 133:14	239:2 240:19	187:3,4 188:15	work 29:9,11
134:7 135:9	242:3 243:5	188:16 190:7,8	97:4 126:6,7

[work - zooming]

Page 57

		z
127:12 217:11	94:18 97:25	
217:15	98:10,11	
workers 235:22	109:14 110:5	zoom 13:22
working 33:4	112:19 115:13	14:4 86:19,21
works 213:14	116:9 123:22	156:17 163:6
216:23	130:3 133:21	175:17,21
worries 163:3,4	137:14 147:16	176:4
163:4	147:16 154:1	zooming 184:8
worry 172:22	155:18 158:20	
write 33:8	163:1 164:24	
171:18	172:23 173:3	
writing 36:12	175:18 194:15	
129:25	196:8 203:22	
written 10:21	230:15,24	
32:7,19 47:4		year 36:15
107:20		56:14 60:15
wrong 110:1		61:1,2 120:11
217:5		172:12 226:15
wrote 83:14		226:16
84:7,8,9 129:10		years 20:10
191:13 216:24		23:5,9 25:14,25
		26:6 27:18
		33:22 34:24
x		43:9 50:1 52:16
x 3:1,11 4:1,3		65:21 66:5
5:1,3 6:1,3		73:18 87:6,24
xeroxed 87:2		88:4 134:18
		y 8:23
		136:2,5 138:10
		yeah 8:6 14:1,7
		138:21 140:23
19:10,15,23		140:24 184:16
20:9 30:12,12		199:9 217:15
30:18 31:1		yesterday
54:22 55:14		13:19 14:5
57:18 58:3,8		york 2:23,23
70:9,22 77:10		
85:4 87:14 90:4		

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted

fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.